SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 1223 02028 7844

DATE DUE

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| NOV 19 1999 | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

792.042
M964e v.1

64-50

MURRAY

ENGLISH DRAMATIC COMPANIES, 1558-1642

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY

# ENGLISH DRAMATIC COMPANIES

1558-1642

ENGLISH TOWNS, CASTLES &c.
visited by
TOURING DRAMATIC COMPANIES
1558 – 1642
IN SCOTLAND:– EDINBURGH
PERTH
ABERDEEN
NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE
NAWORTH CASTLE
HAZLEWOOD
YORK
SKIPTON CASTLE
LONDESBOROUGH
BEVERLEY
GAWTHORPE HALL
HEDON
SMITHILS
LATHOM HOUSE
KNOWSLEY
DONCASTER
LOUTH
CHESTER
STAFFORD
NOTTINGHAM
SHREWSBURY
LICHFIELD
LEICESTER
SYSTON
NORWICH
THETFORD ABBEY
BRIDGNORTH
MERIDEN
SOLIHULL
MARKET BOSWORTH
COVENTRY
LUDLOW & LUDLOW CASTLE
WORCESTER
STRATFORD -ON-AVON
CHESTERTON
SIR WM. SPENCER'S (WORMLEIGHTON)
CAMBRIDGE
KIRTLING
SIR THOMAS LUCY'S KINETON
BANBURY
SAFFRON WALDEN
IPSWICH
HEREFORD
GLOUCESTER
STANTON
OXFORD
[THAME]
CHELMSFORD
ABINGDON
[GT. MARLOW]
HATFIELD HOUSE
LONDON
MARLBOROUGH
WALLINGFORD
READING
WINDSOR
MORTLAKE
CROYDON
FAVERSHAM
FORDWICH
BRISTOL
BATH
MAIDSTONE
CANTERBURY
DOVER
FOLKESTONE
BARNSTAPLE
WINCHESTER
NEW ROMNEY
HYTHE
RYE
SOUTHAMPTON
EXETER
LYME REGIS
BRIDPORT
LAUNCESTON
TAVISTOCK
PLYMOUTH
IN CORNWALL
ST. IVES
SCALE OF MILES
0 10 20 40 60 80 100

# ENGLISH DRAMATIC COMPANIES

1558-1642

BY

JOHN TUCKER MURRAY, M.A.

SOMETIME EDWARD WILLIAM HOOPER FELLOW OF
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

VOLUME I

LONDON COMPANIES, 1558-1642

U. Public Library

BOSTON AND NEW YORK
HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY
1910

792.042
M96fe
V.1

San Francisco Public Library

TO

MY WIFE

# PREFACE

The object of this book is to trace the history of English dramatic companies in London and the provincial towns from 1558 to 1642, from the accession of Queen Elizabeth to the closing of the theatres by the Puritans. No previous attempt, so far as I know, has been made to give an account of these companies in the provinces except Halliwell-Phillipps's and Mr. Sidney Lee's lists of the provincial performances of Shakespeare's company. Collier, Malone, and Chalmers occasionally note the visits of some company to a provincial town but never attempt a history of such a company, and Mr. Fleay, who alone has presented a systematic study of the dramatic companies of the period, frankly ignores the provincial stage.

The highly speculative nature of the history of these companies must have impressed every student of the Elizabethan drama. As, on the available evidence, it seemed impossible to advance far beyond Mr. Fleay's brilliant, if somewhat erratic, conclusions, it was necessary to bring to bear on the subject some considerable body of hitherto unknown facts. The field which appeared to offer the best chance of such a discovery was the records of the provincial towns. A careful examination of the existing town histories, the collections of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, and the few

books dealing with the drama in provincial towns such as Kelly's *Notices of Leicester*, Penley's *Bath Stage*, and Dibdin's *Annals of the Edinburgh Stage* revealed many facts which had been ignored by the general historians of the stage. It also showed that, with the exception of Kelly, Penley, and Dibdin, no attempt had been made by the authors of the various town histories, etc., to collect all the references to the stage in the records they were treating. To do so was naturally outside their purpose, for they only wished to show by the quotation of a few items, that the drama played some part in the social life of the town in which they were interested. Consequently it was imperative that the records of these towns be re-examined and the references to the drama more exhaustively collected. The records of other towns not hitherto investigated had also to be searched.

It soon became evident that several lifetimes would be required if one person were to thoroughly examine all the records of even a few of the more important towns, as in many of these the records have been carefully preserved and are most voluminous. So it was necessary to select for examination only the more promising records in each town. This selection was not difficult, as it was clear that references to the drama usually occurred in the account books, the Mayors' Court books, or the letter-books of the corporations. The cause of this was not far to seek, for when a dramatic company visited a provincial town their first duty was to present their

licence to the Mayor and his court of Aldermen, in order to obtain permission to play. Naturally a note of this application, its result, and some details of the applicants were usually kept by the clerk of the court. Also any dispute which arose involving the players was brought before this court and duly recorded. Then, after a company had received permission to act, it was customary in many towns for them to give a free performance before the Mayor and Aldermen, and such citizens as chose to attend. For this performance they received a 'reward' out of the town coffers. A record of such payments was, of course, made in the town account books, and often, if the entering clerk loved to ply his quill, some details about the company were also noted. Sometimes when the town authorities refused to allow the players to perform, the latter referred them to their patron, to the Privy Council, or to the Master of the Revels, maintaining that no corporation could deny them the right to play if they were properly licensed. Such a situation often led to much correspondence between the various parties concerned, which has occasionally been preserved in the town letter-books.

Of the town records thus examined the most profitable were at Norwich, where the clerk of the Mayor's Court often noted the names of the actors who applied for leave to play, the dates of their licences, and other interesting details. Barnstaple, Bristol, Dover, Coventry, Exeter, Gloucester, Marlborough, Shrewsbury, Southampton, and York also

yielded much new information. As the materials thus collected increased it became evident that my original intention of dealing only with the provincial companies would have to be abandoned, and both the London and the provincial companies would have to be treated. In the case of the London companies this involved a complete reworking of the existing knowledge on the subject in the light of the new materials.

So far as the London sources are concerned, I can lay claim to no new find of importance except the Inner Temple MS., given in vol. ii. as Appendix F. This document Collier mentions, but neither he nor Mr. Fleay seems to have examined it carefully. At any rate they did not transcribe it into their works nor use the details in it. As these details are important this document is worth special notice.

The new material collected from the provincial records has considerably modified the history of almost every known dramatic company of the Elizabethan period, has brought to light a large number of new companies and many hitherto unknown actors, has given much new information about the methods of licensing companies, the relations of the London and provincial companies, the plays acted in the provinces, the places of acting, the attitude of the people toward the players, their earnings and their relation to their patrons. Of these details it has been impossible in this book to treat fully those referring more especially to the customs of the companies. This, I hope to do in a

subsequent work. However, undoubtedly to the general student of the Elizabethan drama and the literary historian of the period, who so far have had to account for the brilliant national drama which culminated in the supreme work of Shakespeare, by the demand of a few theatres and their supporters in London for plays, the fact of importance will be that not only London but most of the towns and villages of England were enthusiastic admirers of the drama and constantly demanding dramatic performances. How truly and how deeply national was the dramatic outburst of the Elizabethan period and why it was so national can only be fully understood when we consider how universally England was interested in the drama.

Incidentally, much of interest to genealogists will be found in these volumes, for concerning many of the patrons of the players, men of title and importance in their day, no word is to be found in the usual sources of genealogical information.

My method of arrangement in this work has been to treat the London companies in vol. i. and the provincial companies in vol. ii. In some cases it has been necessary for the sake of clearness to consider some of the provincial companies in vol. i. Under such circumstances I have endeavoured to avoid all possibility of confusion by cross references. When it was imperative to discuss at length, with elaborate show of evidence, some particular point in the history of a company I have thought it advisable to relegate such a discussion to the Appendices,

rather than to seriously interrupt the course of the narrative.

To the history of each company I have added lists of their Court and provincial performances. In the latter lists I have given in addition to the dates of the companies' visits to the towns, the names under which they appeared. Conjectural matter in these lists, as indeed throughout the book, is placed in square brackets.

In the Appendices will be found many of the documents I have collected for this study, the discussions of the special points already mentioned, and an essay on the relation of the plague to the closing of the London theatres. To this essay I wish to call special attention, as on the theory there advanced are based several of my conclusions about the history of the companies. Also, because appended to it are the London and provincial mortality tables of the plague from 1563 to 1642.

This work was originally begun several years ago as a college thesis at the suggestion of Professor George Pierce Baker of Harvard, to whom I am under great obligation not only for suggesting the subject to me, but for his most generous assistance and encouragement throughout its rather protracted course. To Professor George Lyman Kittredge of Harvard I am also deeply indebted for many kindnesses and much helpful advice at critical stages of my researches. To the Faculty and Corporation of Harvard, who, by appointing me Edward William Hooper Fellow, enabled me to devote an unfettered

year to the examination of the English town records, I wish to express my gratitude. From English scholars I have received many courtesies. Mr. Sidney Lee has been especially helpful, and his suggestions and those of Mr. Hubert Hall saved me from many pitfalls at the beginning of my work among the English records. To the officials in charge of the records of the various towns I have visited I am much in debt for their unfailing consideration and the way in which, often at considerable inconvenience to themselves, they assisted my investigations. Especially kind was Mr. J. C. Tingey, who gave much of his valuable time that my work in Norwich might be facilitated. The authorities of the British Museum, the Public Record Office, and the Inner Temple Library have placed me under deep obligation for privileges of research. I cannot omit from this mention of my indebtedness the name of Professor Archibald MacMechan of Dalhousie College, who, though he has had no direct share in this book, by his enthusiasm and insight first excited my interest in the Elizabethan drama.

In conclusion, may I ask those who use these volumes to bear with any errors they may come upon, for though I have striven for accuracy I fear that in such multiplicity of detail some slips have occurred.

Ballards Shaw, Limpsfield,
Surrey, *March* 30, 1910.

# CONTENTS OF VOL. I


PREFACE . . . . . vii

## LONDON COMPANIES, 1558–1642

### PART I. GREATER MEN'S COMPANIES, 1558–1603

PAGE

I. 1, 2, 3, Queen Elizabeth's Companies . . 3
II. Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester's Company . . 26
III. 1, Earl of Worcester's Company . . . 43
IV. 1, 2, Earl of Pembroke's Companies . . . 59
V. The Strange-Chamberlain Company (*i.e.* 2, Lord Strange —4, Earl of Derby—6, Lord Chamberlain's Company) . . . . . 73
VI. Lord Charles Howard, Lord Admiral's Company . 110

### PART II. GREATER MEN'S COMPANIES, 1603–1642

I. 1, King James I.—1, King Charles I.'s Company . 145
II. 1, 2, 3, Queen Anne—1, Red Bull-Revels Companies . 185
III. Prince Henry—1, Palsgrave—3, Prince Charles's Companies . . . . . 206
IV. Duke of Lenox—Duke of Albany—Duke of York—1, 2, Prince Charles's Companies . . . 228
V. 1, 2, 4, Princess Elizabeth's Companies . . 243
VI. 1, Queen Henrietta's Company . . . 265
VII. 2, Red Bull—2, King Charles I.'s Company . . 271
VIII. 4, King's Revels Company . . . . 279

### PART III. LESSER MEN'S COMPANIES, 1558–1642

I. 1, 2, Lord Ambrose Dudley, Earl of Warwick's Companies . . . . . 285
II. 1, Lord Strange—2, 4, 5, Earl of Derby's Companies . 291
III. 1, Lord Rich's Company . . . . 297
IV. 2, Lord Clinton, Earl of Lincoln's Company . . 299

PAGE

v. 2, Earl of Sussex—2, Lord Chamberlain's Company . 301
vi. Sir Robert Lane's Company . . . . . 309
vii. Earl of Essex—Countess of Essex—Viscount Hereford's Company . . . . . 311
viii. The Earl of Hertford's Company . . . 317
ix. 2, Lord Hunsdon—5, Lord Chamberlain's Company . 319
x. 3, Earl of Arundel's Company . . . 322

Part IV. Children's Companies, 1558–1603

i. St. Paul's Choir . . . . . 325
ii. Chapel Royal Choir . . . . . 331
iii. Windsor Chapel Choir . . . . . 338
iv. Westminster School . . . . . 340
v. Merchant Taylors' School . . . . 342
vi. Eton College . . . . . 343
vii. 2, Earl of Oxford's Company . . . 344

Part V. Children's Companies, 1603–1642

i. St. Paul's Choir—1, King's Revels Company . . 353
ii. 1, 2, 3, 4, Queen's Revels Companies . . . 354
iii. Beeston's Boys, or the King and Queen's Young Company . . . . . 367

# PART I

# GREATER MEN'S COMPANIES

1558-1603

# I

## 1, 2, 3, QUEEN ELIZABETH'S COMPANIES

### I

During the reigns of Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Mary, dramatic companies, called the Queen's men, are frequently mentioned.[1] When Elizabeth came to the throne in November, 1558, she continued the dramatic establishment of the late Queen. This is shown by her treasurer's payment of £30 to the Court 'enterlude players' in 1561,[2] and the frequent visits of the Queen's men to the provincial towns. The names of these players and their wage is learned from the following entry in the Office Books of the Treasurers of the Chamber :—

> 'Payde to thentrelude players viz to John Browne, Edmond Stroodewycke, John Smyth and William Reading euery of them at iij$^{li}$. vj$^{s}$. viij$^{d}$. per Ann and xxiij$^{s}$. iiij$^{d}$. for their Lyuery Cotes yerely to bee payde quarterly dew unto them for one hole yeare ending at Mychas An° iiij°. . . . . xviij$^{li}$.'[3]

This company seems to have remained in the Queen's service till 1585, when it contained eight members, each of them receiving a wage of £3, 6s. 8d. for his

[1] Collier, i. 115-118, 161-162, 165 *n.*; also *Provincial List of Queen's Men*, 17-18.

[2] Collier, i. 173-174.

[3] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxvii.

year's work.[1] How long after 1585 the company was continued, there is nothing to show. The last mention of any of the 1561 actors of the company is in the Treasurer of the Queen's Chamber's Account Book for 1581, when John Smith received his usual yearly salary.[2]

II

In 1574 the enmity between the Lord Mayor and Council of London and the players caused the former to issue an order forbidding all plays in the city, except in private houses, unless the players were licensed by the city authorities, and their plays perused and sanctioned by certain persons appointed by the city.[3] The next year 'Her Majesty's poor players' petitioned against this order, stating that they must have exercise in their craft if they were

[1] In the Queen's *Household Book* of 1585 occur the following entries :— 'Players, fee 38*l.* 4*s.*' and 'Players of Enterluts 8, fee to every of them 3*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.*' (Collier, i. 250 *n.*). The first of these entries probably refers to the Queen's company of twelve players, which was formed in 1583, and the second to the company of Court players which had been continued from Queen Mary's reign, for 'Players of Enterluts' had been their title from the first, and their yearly wage 3*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* each (cf. above, 3). Malone supposed that both entries referred to the company of 1583 (Malone by Boswell, iii. 49), and Mr. Fleay, ignoring these entries, supposes the enterlude players of Mary to have been 'superannuated' on the accession of Elizabeth, and that no company in particular bore the Queen's name till 1583 (*Stage*, 43-44). Malone's theory seems improbable, as Collier pointed out (Collier, i. 250), for the entries in the *Household Book* for 1585 seem obviously to distinguish between two companies of players. Mr. Fleay's theory is untenable, because the provincial records from 1558 to 1583 distinguish between the Queen's company and those noblemen's companies which performed before the Queen. (Cf. Appendix G, *Leicester Accounts*, 1563-4, ii. 299).

[2] Collier, i. 236.

[3] *Ibid.*, 207-212. Collier wrongly dates this order 1575. It was issued on Dec. 6, during the mayoralty of Sir James Hawes, 1574, Oct. 29, to 1575, Oct. 29 (Fleay, *Stage*, 47).

to act acceptably before Her Majesty, and requesting that only 'Her Majesty's servants' be permitted to play. The city replied to this petition point by point, and to the request that only 'Her Majesty's servants' be permitted to play in the city, replied 'that the last yere, when such toleration was of the Quenes players only, all the places of playeng were filled with men calling themselves the Queenes players. Your Lordships may do well, in your lettres or warrants for their toleration, to expresse the number of the Quenes players, and particularly all their names.'[1] This shows that after 1574, at least, all the companies who expected to perform before the Queen at Christmas, such as the Earl of Leicester's, the Earl of Warwick's, Lord Clinton's, St. Paul's choir boys, etc., as well as the Court interlude players, sometimes called themselves 'Her Majesty's players.' Probably they did this only when in London, to avoid the Lord Mayor's regulations against players, for when in the provinces, they seem to have regularly appeared under the titles of their respective patrons.[2]

In 1576 the Lord Mayor and Corporation of London proposed to the Privy Council certain regulations of players in the city. Among these was one requiring, 'That the Quenes players only be tolerated, and of them their number, and certaine names to be notified in your L^lps^ lettres to the L. Maior and to the justices of Midd'x and Surrey. And those her players not to divide themselves into several companies.'[3] Nothing seems to have come

[1] Collier, i. 213-216.

[2] Cf. above, 4 *n.*

[3] Collier, i. 217.

of this proposal. On December 24, 1578, the Privy Council wrote to the Lord Mayor, requiring him to suffer the Children of the Chapel and St. Paul's, and the players of the Lord Chamberlain (*i.e.* Earl of Sussex), the Earls of Warwick, Leicester, and Essex, to act in the city, because they had been appointed to act before the Queen during the Christmas holidays.[1]

This bickering between the City and the Privy Council, as to who were to be considered 'Her Majesty's players,' was not settled till 1583, when a new company under the Queen's especial patronage was formed. Howes, in his additions to Stow's *Chronicle*, gives the following account of the formation of this company:—

'Comedians and stage-players of former time were very poor and ignorant in respect of these of this time; but being now [*i.e.* 1583] growne very skilfull and exquisite actors for all matters, they were entertained into the service of divers great lords: out of which companies there were twelve of the best chosen, and, at the request of Sir Francis Walsingham, they were sworn the queenes servants, and were allowed wages and liveries as groomes of the chamber: and untill this yeare 1583, the queene had no players. Among these twelve players were two rare men, viz., Thomas Wilson,[2] for a quicke, delicate, refined, extemporall witt, and Richard Tarleton, for a wondrous plentifull pleasant extemporall wit, he was the wonder of his tyme.'[3]

---

[1] Chalmers, *Apology*, 373; cf. also below, 312.

[2] *I.e.* Robert Wilson. Collier (i. 247 *n.*) imputes Howes' mistake to Malone, who quotes Howes accurately (Malone by Boswell, iii. 49 *n.*). Fleay (*Stage*, 34) points out Collier's mistake.

[3] Stow, *Chronicle*, ed. Howes, edit. 1615, under year 1583.

If Howe's statement that before 1583 the Queen had no players be not a mistake, it probably means that the Court interlude players who acted under the title of 'the Queen's players' were regarded not as being under the Queen's especial patronage, but as a part of the royal household inherited from Queen Mary, and continued during Elizabeth's pleasure.

This new Queen's company, the members of which were chosen for Elizabeth by Edmund Tylney, Master of the Revels, about March, 1583,[1] seems to have contained in addition to Wilson and Tarleton, James Burbage, John Laneham, and possibly John Perkyn and William Johnson from Leicester's men, Laurence and John Dutton, from the Earl of Warwick's men, and Bently, John Singer, and William Slaughter from other noblemen's companies.

That Burbage, Laneham, and Wilson joined the Queen's company in 1583 from the Earl of Leicester's men is practically certain.[2] Perkyn and Johnson are not mentioned in any company after they appear in the Privy Seal of Leicester's men for 1574.[3] As Perkyn was, at that time, the second name on the list of Leicester's men, and Johnson came before Wilson, there is a presumption that as actors of such standing, they would be drafted into the new Queen's company of 1583. This, however, is mere conjecture. Laurence and John Dutton probably joined the Queen's men in 1583 from the Earl of Warwick's company, for in 1588-9 they are mentioned at Nottingham, as Queen's men.[4] Tarleton, Bently, and Singer appeared as Queen's men in June,

[1] Collier, i. 247 *n.*
[2] Cf. below, 32-33.
[3] *Ibid.*, 27.
[4] Cf. ii. 375.

1583, at Norwich.[1] Will. Slaughter, or 'Black Will,' and 'Jack Denton,' *i.e.* John Dutton, appeared in *The true tragedy of Richard* 3,' which was entered in the Stationers' Register for June 19, 1594. As it was played by 'the Queen's Majesty's players,' possibly as early as 1585-6,[2] the probabilities are that Will. Slaughter was a Queen's man in 1583. This accounts for eleven of the twelve men chosen for the Queen's company in 1583; there is nothing to indicate who was the twelfth player.

Almost immediately after its formation, the Queen's company was forced to leave London on account of the Plague.[3] During April and May, a Queen's company, in all probability the new company, appeared at Bristol and Gloucester. By June 15 these men had reached Norwich, probably *via* Shrewsbury, Nottingham, and Leicester. At Norwich some of the Queen's men were involved in a broil in which a man was killed. It seems that the company was performing at the Red Lion Inn, in St. Stephen's, Bently playing 'the Duke.' After the play had started, one Wynsdon tried to gain admittance without paying, and in the ensuing scuffle overset the money. Three of the players, Tarleton, Bently, and Singer ran to see what the

[1] Cf. below.

[2] Fleay, *Drama*, ii. 315-316. 'Black Will' is also mentioned as an actor in *Arden of Faversham*.

[3] On Jan. 31 the plague deaths in London for the preceding week were estimated at forty (ii. 184). On April 27, 1583, the Lord Mayor wrote to Mr. Young, a justice of the peace for an adjoining district, about prohibiting plays intended to be performed on the 1st May (Collier, i. 238-239). Though there are no records of the plague deaths between February 1 and April 27, there is every likelihood that they were of such number as to prohibit playing in London.

trouble might be. Wynsdon then fled, and was pursued by Singer and Bently, Tarleton in vain trying to restrain Bently. During the pursuit, Wynsdon was joined by his servant, 'a man in a blue coat,' who threw a stone at Bently and 'broke his head.' Bently, who had been joined by Henry Browne, Sir William Paston's man, continued the pursuit. When Bently and Browne overtook the 'man in a blue coat,' they thrust at him with their swords, Browne giving him the wound from which he died.[1] Evidently the company was not detained long in Norwich on account of this incident, for on July 9 it appeared at Cambridge.

The Queen's men probably returned to London about November, for on November 26, 1583, the Privy Council wrote to the Lord Mayor, informing him that they had licensed this company, and on December 1, Sir Francis Walsingham wrote to the Lord Mayor, explaining 'the intentions of the Lords of the Council in granting a licence to the Queen's Players.'[2] These letters would hardly have been necessary if the Queen's men were still in the provinces.

In June, 1584, the Queen's men were involved in a disturbance which almost led to the pulling down of the Theatre and the Curtain. On Whitsunday, June 7, there were no plays in London, and consequently the Lord Mayor and his brethren enjoyed in peace a sermon preached in 'the new churche yarde nere Bethlehem.' But, on Monday night, the city was much disturbed by the turmoil

[1] Halliwell-Phillipps, *Illustrations*, 120.
[2] Collier, i. 239.

which sprang out of a quarrel between a prentice and one Challis, who found the prentice sleeping on the grass near the Theatre or Curtain, and 'dyd turne upon the too upon the belly of the same prentice.' On the following Wednesday, one Browne wounded a prentice at the door of the Theatre, and as a result, a crowd of about one thousand people assembled.[1] In consequence of these disturbances, 'Upon Soundaye [*i.e.* June 14], my Lord sent ii aldermen to the Cowrt for the suppressing and pulling downe of the Theatre and Curten, for all the Lords agreed thereunto, saving my Lord Chamberlen and Mr. Vice-Ch., but we obteyned a lettre to suppresse theym all. Upon the same night I sent for the Qwenes players and my Lord of Arundel his players, and they all well nighe obeyed the Lordes lettres. The chiefest of her Highnes players advised me to send for the owner of the Theater,[2] who was a stubborne fellow, and to bynd him. I dyd so. He sent me word that he was my Lord of Hunsdens man and that he wold not comme at me, but he wold in the mornyng ride to my Lord. Then I sent the under-shereff for hym, and he browght hym to me, and at his commyng, he showtted me owt very Justice; and in the end I shewed hym my Lord his master's hand, and then he was more quiet; but, to die for it, he wold not be bound. And then I mynding to send hym to prison, he made sute that he might be bounde to appere at the oier and determiner, the which is to-morowe, where he said that

[1] Collier, i. 252.

[2] John Hyde, probably, to whom Burbadge had assigned his Shoreditch estate on September 17, 1579 (Halliwell-Phillipps, *Outlines*, i. 358).

he was suer the court wold not bynd hym, being a counselers man; and so I have graunted his request, where he shal be sure to be bounde, or els ys lyke to do worse.'[1] In this affair the Queen's men seem to have acted with circumspection, and not to have roused the ire of the Lord Mayor against themselves. At this time it is evident that the Queen's men were acting at the Theatre, and the Lord of Arundel's at the Curtain. The fact that Hyde, the owner of the Theatre, described himself as a Lord Hunsdon's man, may indicate that Lord Hunsdon's company was also acting at the Theatre about this time.[2]

From 1584 to 1588 the Queen's company acted frequently both at Court and in the provinces. On January 25, 1587, Walsingham's spy mentioned the Queen's men as one of the companies who daily set up players' bills in the City.[3] When in London they probably still acted at the Theatre.

III

By 1588 there seem to have been two Queen's companies, one of them acting in London and the provinces, the other performing in the provinces only. In 1588-9 the Queen's men acted at Court on Dec. 26, 1588, and Feb. 9, 1589. During the same years a Queen's company acted at Ipswich on Dec. 17, 1588, at Dover [*c.* Christmas, 1588], at Maidstone [*c.* Jan. 21, 1589], and at Canterbury, *c.* Feb.

[1] Halliwell-Phillipps, *Illustrations*, 41.
[2] Fleay, *Stage*, 40.
[3] Collier, i. 257.

2, 1589. All these performances could hardly have been by the same company. Besides, during 1588-9 the provincial records seem to distinguish between two Queen's companies. Thus in Leicester 'certen of' the Queen's players appeared on Nov. 6, 1588, and 'others moe' of the Queen's players on May 20, 1589. By 1590-1 there is still more conclusive evidence of the existence of two Queen's companies. On Jan. 1 and Jan. 3, 1591, a Queen's company performed at Court, and on Jan. 2, 1591, a Queen's company appeared at Maidstone. On May 15, 1591, the Queen's players received a reward at Ipswich and on May 18, 1591, 'another company of the Quenes players' were rewarded by the same corporation. The fact that in 1588-9, and 1590-1, while one Queen's company was acting at Court, the other was acting in the provinces, would seem to indicate that one of these companies was a London company, and the other a provincial company.[1] It is very doubtful if the Queen's provincial company was continued after 1592, for the

[1] The Queen had a company of tumblers under the management of one Symons. In the Nottingham records for 1588-89 occur the following entries:—'Item given in reward to Symons and his companie, beinge the Quenes players, xxs.' 'Symons and his fellowes shewed' feats of activity before the Queen at Greenwich on Jan. 1, 1585 (Cunningham, *Revels*, 188). These men Fleay supposed to be the Lord Strange's men, who had shown feats of activity before the Queen on Jan. 29, 1580 (Fleay, *Stage*, i. 28, 30; Cunningham, *Revels*, 177). Whether or not 'Symons and his fellowes' were ever Lord Strange's men, [they were probably under the Queen's patronage by 1585, and certainly by 1588-9. The Queen had also a bear-ward, who frequently exhibited his bears in the provinces (cf. ii. Appendix G, Canterbury, 1562-3, Plymouth, 1564-5, Gloucester, 1570-1, Ipswich, 1572-3, etc.); a company of trumpeters (cf. ii. Appendix G, Worcester, 1591-2); a company of musicians (cf. ii. Appendix G, Canterbury, 1592-3); a jester, Lockwood (cf. ii. Appendix G, Nottingham, 1568-9), and a juggler (cf. ii. Appendix G, Gloucester, 1563-4).

appearances of a Queen's company in the provinces after 1591-2 decrease considerably, and could easily have been accomplished by the Queen's London Company when on tour.

If the Queen's men were still acting at the Theatre in the autumn of 1589, it is evident that they then became involved in the Martin Marprelate controversy, for a marginal note to Lyly's *Pap with a Hatchet* (*c.* September, 1589; cf. Arber, 197-200), referring to Martin, says:—'If he be showed at Paul's it will cost you four pence, if at the Theatre two pence, if at St. Thomas a Watrings,[1] nothing.'

From 1584 to December, 1591, the Queen's men acted yearly at Court. During these years the only company to challenge their supremacy was the Admiral's. After 1591, however, the Queen's men were superseded at Court by Lord Strange's men, and lost their former position of eminence. Whether this was due to the company's deterioration by loss of actors, or the failure to present attractive plays, or the superiority of Lord Strange's men, is uncertain.

Though not acting at Court after 1591, the Queen's company continued to act in London and the provinces. During 1591 they sometimes acted with the Earl of Sussex's men, and in 1592 Dutton is mentioned as their chief player in Coventry and Cambridge. From April 1 to April 8, 1594, they acted with the Earl of Sussex's men, almost certainly at the Rose.[2] They also acted in London, at what playing-place is unknown, till May 3, when they left

[1] The place of execution, not far from the theatre.

[2] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 17.

London for the provinces. This is shown by the following entry in Henslowe's *Diary*,—

'Lent vnto frances Henslow the 3 of Maye 1593 to laye downe for his share to the Quenes players when they broke & went into the contrey to playe the some of fyftenpownd to be payd vnto me at his Retorne owt of the contrey J saye lent . . . . . xv$^{ll}$.
wittnes John towne
Hew daves &
Richard alleyn.'[1]

Whether Francis Henslowe had been a member of the Queen's company before May 3, 1594, is doubtful. John Towne, Hugh Davis, and Richard Alleyn were probably members of the Queen's company in 1593, for in July, 1597, John Towne is mentioned as a Queen's man in the Nottingham records.[2] After May 3, 1594, the Queen's company did not appear in London.

On June 1, 1595, Philip Henslowe made the following entry in his *Diary*,—

'lent vnto ffrances henslow the j of June 1595 Jn Redey mony to laye downe for his hallfe share w$^{th}$ the company w$^{ch}$ he dothe play w$^{th}$ all to be payd vnto me when he doth Receue his mony w$^{ch}$ he lent to my lord burte or when my asyenes dothe demand yt wittnes J saye nyne pownd. . . . . ix$^{ll}$.
wm. smyght player
gorge attewell player
Robard nycowlles player.'[3]

[1] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 4. Fleay dates this entry 1593 (*Stage*, 81). But as there is no recorded connection between Henslowe and the Queen's company till April 1-8, 1594, and Henslowe was very careless in entering the year of his transactions, often carrying one year far into the next, it seems almost certain that in this case he meant May 3, 1594.

[2] Cf. ii. 377.

[3] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 6.

The company here referred to is probably the Queen's, and William Smith, George Attewell, and Robert Nicholls, as well as Francis Henslowe, were most likely members of it.

The Queen's men probably acted in the provinces till the Queen's death, for they appeared in Coventry between Dec. 20, 1602, and March 24, 1603. After the Queen's death they had to abandon their title to the Earl of Worcester's company, who became Queen Anne's men. Not improbably they passed under the patronage of Ludovic Stuart, Duke of Lenox, whose players are mentioned for the first time in 1604-5, and included Francis Henslowe.[1]

[1] Cf. below, 228-229. Fleay dates Queen Elizabeth's men from 1583 to 1592 (*Stage*, 369). This is inaccurate even for London, because the Queen's men acted under P. Henslowe's management, probably at the Rose, from April 1 to April 8, 1594 (*Diary*, ed. Greg, 17).

## COURT PERFORMANCES

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1584. Dec. 26, . . . | *Phillyda and Corin.* | (The Queen's players).[1] |
| 1585. Jan. 3, . . . . | *Felix and Philomena.* | ( ,, ).[2] |
| Jan. 6, . . . . | *Five Plays in One.* | ( ,, ).[3] |
| Feb. 21, . . . . | *Three Plays in One.* | ( ,, ).[4] |
| Feb. 23, . . . . | An Antic play and a Comedy. | ( ,, ).[5] |
| 1586. Feb. 13, . . . | | ( ,, ).[6] |
| 1587-8. Xmas and Shrovetide, | Three plays. | ( ,, ).[7] |
| 1588. Dec. 26, . . . | | ( ,, ).[8] |
| 1589. Feb. 9, . . . | | ( ,, ).[8] |
| Dec. 26, . . . . | | ( ,, ).[9] |
| 1590. March 1, . . . | | ( ,, ).[9] |
| Dec. 26, . . . . | | ( ,, ).[10] |
| 1591. Jan. 1, . . . . | | ( ,, ).[10] |

| | |
|---|---|
| Jan. 3, . . . . | (The Queen's players).[10] |
| Jan. 6, . . . . | ( ,, ).[10] |
| Feb. 14, . . . . | ( ,, ).[10] |
| Dec. 26, . . . . | ( ,, ).[11] |

## NOTES TO COURT PERFORMANCES.

[1] Cunningham, *Revels*, 188. This performance was before the Queen at Greenwich on 'St. Stephen's daie at night.'

[2] Cunningham, *Revels*, 189. This performance was before the Queen at Greenwich 'on the sondaie next after newyeares daie, at night.' Concerning this play as the probable source of Shakespeare's *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, cf. Ward, *History*, ii. 80-81 ; Fleay, *Drama*, ii. 297 *seqq.*

[3] Cunningham, *Revels*, 189. This performance was before the Queen at Greenwich 'on Twelfedaie at night.'

[4] *Ibid.*, 189. This play was to have 'ben shewed before her highnes on Shrovesondie at night,' at Somerset place ; but 'the Quene came not abroad that night.' These plays were probably a revival of Tarleton's *Seven Deadly Sins*, Pts. I. and II. (cf. below, 137 f.).

[5] Cunningham, *Revels*, 189. This performance was given at Somerset place on 'Shrovetuesdaie at night,' the Queen being present.

[6] Chalmers, *Apology*, 399 ; Cunningham, *Revels*, 198. The Queen's players were paid £10 on March 6, 1586, for a play presented before the Queen on Shrove Sunday.

[7] Chalmers, *Apology*, 399. The Queen's men were paid £20 on March 4, 1588, for three plays presented before Her Majesty at Christmas and Shrovetide. One of these plays was apparently performed on Shrove Tuesday, and the Earl of Warwick obtained a 'warrant for payment' to the company (Collier, i. 259-260).

[8] Chalmers, *Apology*, 399. On March 16, 1589, the Queen's players were paid £20 for presenting before the Queen two plays, one on St. Stephen's day and one on Shrove Sunday. The Admiral's men also presented a play before the Queen on Shrove Sunday. Possibly one play was given in the afternoon and one in the evening.

[9] Chalmers, *Apology*, 399. On March 15, 1590, John Dutton and John Laneham were paid £20 for 'two interludes' presented before the Queen on St. Stephen's day and Shrove Sunday last.'

[10] Chalmers, *Apology*, 399, 400 ; Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxii ; Fleay, *Stage*, 77. According to Chalmers, who quotes from the *Council Registers*, the Queen's players were paid £26, 13s. 4d., and given a reward of £13, 6s. 8d. on March 5, 1591, for presenting four 'interludes' before Her Majesty on 'St. Stephen's day, Sunday after New-year's day, Twelfth day, and Shrove Sunday.' On the same day, the same players were paid £6, 13s. 4d., and given a reward of £3, 6s. 8d. for playing an 'interlude'

before the Queen on New Year's day. Cunningham, who quotes from the *Treasurer's Office Book*, dates the corresponding entries March 7, 1591, and adds the following details: in the first entry the payment is to 'Lawrence Dutton and John Dutton her Ma^ts players and their Companie'; in the second to 'John Laneham and his company her Ma^ts. players.' From these entries Cunningham concludes that there were two companies of Queen's players acting in London about New Year, 1590-1. This is impossible, unless the Queen had three companies in 1590-1, for though the Queen had two companies at this time, one most likely a travelling provincial company, the other a regular London company, they could not both be acting at Court during the Christmas holidays of 1590-1, for on Jan. 1 and Jan. 3 a Queen's company acted at Court, and on Jan. 2 another Queen's Company acted at Maidstone.

[11] Chalmers, *Apology*, 400. On Feb. 27, 1592, the Queen's players were paid £10 for presenting a play before Her Majesty on 'St. Stephen's day last.'

## PROVINCIAL VISITS

### I

### Queen's Players before Queen Elizabeth's Reign

(Under Henry VIII., April 22, 1509–Jan. 28, 1547.)

| | |
|---|---|
| 1509. April 22–1540, April 21, . | Thetford Priory. (The Queen's players). |
| [1509. April 22–1547. Jan. 28], | Bewdley. ( „ ). |
| 1530-1, . . . . . | Southampton. ( „ ). |
| 1543-4. Sept. 29–Xmas, '43, . | Canterbury. ( „ ). |
| 1546-7. November, '46, . . | Norwich, played the *Market of Mischief*. ( „ ). |

(Under Edward VI., Jan. 28, 1547–July 6, 1553. Patroness, probably, Catherine Parr, d. 1548.)

| | |
|---|---|
| 1547-8. Oct. 20, '47, . . | Bristol. (The Queen's players). |

(Under Philip and Mary, July 25, 1554–Nov. 17, 1558.)

| | |
|---|---|
| 1555-6, . . . . . | Ipswich. (The King's and Queen's players). |
| [After Christmas], . . | Leicester. (The Queen's players). |
| | Gloucester. ( „ ). |
| 1556-7, . . . . . | Norwich. ( „ ). |
| | Oxford. ( „ ). |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| May, '57, . . . | Bristol. | (The King's and Queen's players). |
| 1557-8, . . . . . | Leicester. | (The Queen's players). |
| | Dover. | The King's and Queen's players). |
| 1558, . . . . . | Barnstaple. | (The King's and Queen's players). |
| | Barnstaple. | (The Queen's players).[1] |
| | Lyme Regis. | ( „ ).[2] |

[1] Whether Mary or Elizabeth is doubtful.
[2] *Ibid.*

II

## Queen's Players under Elizabeth, Nov. 17, 1558-March 24, 1603

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1558-9. Xmas, '58–March, '59, . | Canterbury. | (The Queen's players). |
| *c.* May 13, '59, . . . | Dover. | ( „ ). |
| 1559-60. Oct., '59, . . . | Bristol. | ( „ ). |
| November, '59, . . . | Ludlow. | ( „ ). |
| | Gloucester. | ( „ ). |
| | Leicester. | ( „ ). |
| 1560-1. Xmas, '60—March, '61, | Canterbury. | ( „ ). |
| | Faversham. | ( „ ). |
| | Winchester. | ( „ ). |
| | Plymouth. | ( „ ). |
| | Barnstaple. | ( „ ). |
| | Norwich. | ( „ ). |
| 1561-2. [After Xmas, '61], . | Leicester. | ( „ ). |
| | Norwich. | ( „ ). |
| | Tavistock. | ( „ ). |
| | Gloucester. | ( „ ). |
| 1562-3, . . . . . | Canterbury. | ( „ ). |
| May 19, '63, . . . | Dover. | ( „ ). |
| [June 9–Aug. '63], . . | Plymouth. | ( „ ). |
| August, '63, . . . | Bristol. | ( „ ). |
| Oct. 4, '63, . . . . | Ipswich. | ( „ ). |
| 1563-4. March 12, '63, . . | Ipswich. | ( „ ). |
| March 20, '63, . . . | Ipswich. | ( „ ). |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Norwich. | (The Queen's players). |
| August 2, '63, . . . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| 1564, . . . . . | Abingdon. | ( ,, ). |
| 1564-5. *c.* May, '65, . . . | Canterbury. | ( ,, ). |
| *c.* May 25, '65, . . . | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| | Folkestone. | ( ,, ). |
| | Plymouth. | ( ,, ). |
| | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| 1565-6, . . . . . | Oxford. | ( ,, ). |
| July, '66, . . . . | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |
| | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| 1565-6, . . . . . | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| 1566-7. *c.* May, '67, . . | Canterbury. | ( ,, ). |
| May 13, '67, . . . | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| | Winchester. | ( ,, ). |
| July, '67, . . . . | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |
| Oct. 9, '67, . . . . | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |
| 1567-8. '68, . . . . | Abingdon. | ( ,, ). |
| | Oxford. | ( ,, ). |
| July, '68, . . . . | Shrewsbury. | ( ,, ). |
| 1568-9, . . . . . | Canterbury. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov., '68, . . . . | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| | Maidstone. | ( ,, ). |
| | Plymouth. | ( ,, ). |
| August, '69, . . . | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |
| Midsummer—Sept. 28, '69, . | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |
| 1569-70. Dec. 7, '69, . . | Oxford. | ( ,, ). |
| | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| 1570-1, . . . . . | Canterbury. | ( ,, ). |
| May, '71, . . . . | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| | Winchester. | ( ,, ). |
| 1571-2. May 23, '72, . . | Nottingham. | ( ,, ). |
| | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| | Oxford. | ( ,, ). |
| 1572-3, . . . . . | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |
| 1573, . . . . . | Winchester College. | ( ,, ). |
| 1581-2. [Sept. 29–Oct. 6, '81], . | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |

III

The following entries probably refer to both the Court Interlude players and the Queen's new company of March, 1583, for a year or two, then most likely only to the 1583 company till about 1588-89. After that they refer to both the Queen's London and provincial companies. After 1592 they probably refer only to the London company.

| | |
|---|---|
| 1582-3. April, '83, . . . | Bristol. { (The Queen's players). |
| [*c.* May 23, '83], . . | Gloucester. ( ,, ). |
| | Shrewsbury. ( ,, ). |
| | Nottingham. ( ,, ). |
| | Leicester. ( ,, ). |
| 1582-3. June 15, '83, . . | Norwich. ( ,, ). |
| July 9, '83, . . . | Cambridge. ( ,, ). |
| [*c.* August ,'83], . . . | Canterbury. ( ,, ). |
| | Dover. ( ,, ). |
| [June 2–Sept. 28, '83], . | Abingdon. ( ,, ). |
| 1583-4, . . . . . | Marlborough. ( ,, ). |
| Jan., '84–Sept. 28, '84, . | Southampton. ( ,, ). |
| June 15, '83–June 16, '84, . | Bath. ( ,, ). |
| | Cambridge. ( ,, ). |
| August, '84, . . . | York. ( ,, ). |
| 1584-5. Sept. 30, '84, . . | Leicester. ( ,, ). |
| 1585-6, . . . . . | Abingdon. ( ,, ). |
| March 23–Sept. 28, '86, . | Exeter. ( ,, ). |
| July, '86, . . . . | Bristol. ( ,, ). |
| Aug. 22, '86, . . . | Faversham. ( ,, ). |
| Late '86, . . . . | Faversham. ( ,, ). |
| Sept. 27, '86, . . . | Canterbury. ( ,, ). |
| | Norwich. ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 30, '85–Nov. 15, '86, . | Coventry. ( ,, ). |
| June 9–Sept. 28, '86, . . | Leicester. ( ,, ). |
| 1586-7. '87, . . . . | Abingdon. ( ,, ). |
| | Stratford-on-Avon. ( ,, ). |
| | Worcester. ( ,, ). |
| | Gloucester. ( ,, ). |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| June 14, '86–June 14, '87, | Bath. | (The Queen's players). |
| July 27, '87, | Southampton. | ( ,, ). |
| Aug. 19–Sept. 2, '87, | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| | Maidstone. | ( ,, ). |
| Sept. 9, '87, | York. | ( ,, ). |
| | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| Sept., '87, | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |
| Sept. 23–Oct. 8, '87, | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| 1587-8. March 27, '88, | Canterbury. | ( ,, ). |
| April 6–27, '88, | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. '87–Nov. '88, | Maidstone. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 14, '87–Dec. 4, '88, | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| | Worcester. | ( ,, ). |
| July 12, '88, | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| July 13, '88, | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| | Exeter. | ( ,, ). |
| [May 15–Sept. 28, '88], | Plymouth. | ( ,, ). |
| Oct. 12-19, '88, | Knowsley (Lancs.). | ( ,, ). |
| 1588-9. Nov. 6, '88, | Leicester. | ('certen of' the Queen's players). |
| Dec. 10, '88, | Norwich. | (The Queen's players). |
| Dec. 17, '88, | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |
| [*c.* Xmas, '88], | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| [*c.* Jan. 21, '89], | Maidstone. | ( ,, ). |
| *c.* Feb. 2, '89, | Canterbury. | ( ,, ). |
| March 10, '89, | Winchester. | ( ,, ). |
| April 17, '89, | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| Dec. 4, '88–Nov. 26, '89, | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| May 20, '89, | Leicester. | ('others moe' of the Queen's players). |
| May 27, '89, | Ipswich. | (The Queen's players). |
| June 3, '89, | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| Dec. 4, '88–Nov. 26, '89, | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| | Nottingham. | ('to the Quenes players, the two Duttons and others'). |
| July 12–18, '89, | Knowsley (Lancs.). | ( ,, ). |
| July 19, '89, | Bath. | ( ,, ). |

| | |
|---|---|
| Aug. 2, '89, . . . | Maidstone. (The Queen's players). |
| Aug. 3–Sept. 6, '89, . . | Dover. ( ,, ). |
| [*c.* August, '89], . . . | Canterbury. ( ,, ). |
| August 14, '89, . . . | Bath. ( ,, ). |
| Sept. 13-14, '89, . . . | Knowsley (Lancs.). ( ,, ). |
| Sept., '89, . . . . | Winchester. ( ,, ).[1] |
| 1589-90. Nov., '89, . . . | Bath. ( ,, ). |
| | Nottingham. ( ,, ). |
| July 1-2, '90, . . . | Knowsley (Lancs.). ( ,, ). |
| | Shrewsbury. ( ,, ). |
| July, '90, . . . . | Ludlow. ( ,, ). |
| [June 30–Sept. 17, '90], . | Gloucester. ( ,, ). |
| | Exeter. ( ,, ). |
| | Winchester. ( ,, ). |
| *c.* end July, '90, . . . | Marlborough. ( ,, ). |
| Aug. 10, '90, . . . | Canterbury. ( ,, ). |
| | Faversham. ( ,, ).[2] |
| 1590-1. Oct. 30, '90, . . | Leicester. ( ,, ). |
| Jan. 2, '91, . . . | Maidstone. ( ,, ). |
| Jan. 11, '91, . . . | Canterbury. ( ,, ). |
| Jan. 23–Feb. 13, '91, . . | Dover. ( ,, ). |
| | Faversham. ( ,, ).[3] |
| Feb., '91, . . . . | Winchester. ( ,, ). |
| Shrove Sunday (Feb. 14, '91), | Southampton. (The Queen's players, with Sussex's men). |
| March 24, '91, . . . | Coventry. (The Queen's players, with Sussex's men). |
| | Cambridge. (The Queen's players). |
| May 15, '91, . . . | Ipswich. ( ,, ). |
| May 18, '91, . . . | Ipswich. (Another company of Queen's players). |
| June 2, '91, . . . | Faversham. (The Queen's players). |
| | Maidstone. ( ,, ). |
| June, '91, . . . . | Winchester. ( ,, ). |
| June 23, '91, . . . | Norwich. ( ,, ). |
| June 29, '91, . . . | Southampton. (Mr. Dutton and the Queen's players). |
| | Gloucester. (The Queen's players, and with the Earl of Sussex's men).[4] |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Shrewsbury. (The Queen's players). |
| Aug. 24, '91, . . . | Coventry. ( ,, ). |
| Oct. 20, '91, . . . | Coventry. ( ,, ). |
| 1591-2. March 30, '92, . . | Canterbury. ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 2, '91–Nov. 2, '92, . | Maidstone. ( ,, ). |
| June 20, '91–June 10, '92, . | Bath. ( ,, ). |
| May 1, '92, . . . | Ipswich. ( ,, ). |
| May 27, '92, . . . | Norwich. ( ,, ).[5] |
| | Nottingham. ( ,, ). |
| | Leicester. ( ,, ). |
| | Coventry. (Mr. Dutton's players). |
| | Coventry. (The Queen's players). |
| | Stratford-on-Avon. ( ,, ). |
| | Worcester. (The Queen's players, with the Queen's trumpeters). |
| June 20, '91–June 10, '92, . | Bath. (The Queen's players). |
| Aug. 3, '92, . . . | Southampton. ( ,, ). |
| | Winchester. ( ,, ). |
| *c.* Sept. 8, '92, . . . | Cambridge and Chesterton. (The Queen's players, 'one Dutton is a principal.') |
| 1592-3. Nov. 26, '92, . . | Southampton. (The Queen's players). |
| | Canterbury. ( ,, ). |
| | Ipswich. ( ,, ). |
| June 20, '93, . . . | Leicester. ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 29, '92–Nov. 26, '93, . | Coventry. ( ,, ). |
| | Stratford-on-Avon. ( ,, ). |
| [*c.* Aug. 10, '93], . . . | Southampton. ( ,, ). |
| | Plymouth. ( ,, ). |
| Aug. 22, '93, . . . | Bath. ( ,, ). |
| Sept., '93, . . . . | York. ( ,, ). |
| 1593-4. '93, . . . . | Canterbury. ( ,, ). |
| | Maidstone. ( ,, ). |
| Oct. 18, '93, . . . | Norwich. ( ,, ). |
| July 4, '94, . . . | Coventry. ( ,, ). |
| | Leicester. ( ,, ). |
| | Gloucester. ( ,, ). |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aug., '94, . . . . | Bristol. | (The Queen's players). |
| | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| | Barnstaple. | ( ,, ). |
| 1594-5. April 3, '95, . . . | Winchester. | ( ,, ). |
| April 23, '95, . . . | Exeter. | ( ,, ). |
| [Sept.], '94–Oct. 10, '95, . | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| June 25, '95, . . . | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| Aug. 29, '95, . . . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| Aug. 23–Sept. 13, '95, . | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| | Maidstone. | ( ,, ). |
| 1595-6. '96, . . . . | Faversham. | ( ,, ). |
| | Maidstone. | ( ,, ). |
| | Exeter. | ( ,, ). |
| | Bridgnorth. | ( ,, ). |
| Aug., '96, . . . . | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |
| | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| | Ludlow. | ( ,, ). |
| | Worcester. | ( ,, ). |
| | Coventry. | ( ,, ).[6] |
| | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| | Cambridge. | ( ,, ). |
| 1596-7. March 22–April 4, '97, . | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| Oct. 14, '96–Oct. 14, '97, . | Bath. | ( ,, ).[7] |
| St. James's week (*c.* July 25, '97, . . . . | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |
| | Shrewsbury. | ( ,, ). |
| | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| 1597-8, . . . . . | Marlborough. | ( ,, ). |
| Oct. 14, '97–Oct. 30, '98, . | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| Xmas week, '97, . . . | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |
| | Worcester. | ( ,, ). |
| Jan. 9, '98, . . . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| April 12–May 13, '98, . . | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| June 27, '98, . . . | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| July 8, '98, . . . | Nottingham. | (Towne received a release for a debt in Nottingham, so presumably the Queen's Company, of which |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | he was a member, visited that town). | |
| Aug., '98, . . . | York. | (The Queen's players). |
| 1598-9. March 3, '99, . . | Winchester. | ( ,, ). |
| | Plymouth. | ( ,, ). |
| April 21–May 5, '99, . . | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| 1599-1600. [After Nov., '99], . | York. | ( ,, ). |
| June 2, '00, . . . . | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |
| Aug. 2, '00, . . . | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| | Shrewsbury. | ( ,, ). |
| | Winchester. | ( ,, ). |
| 1600-1. Xmas, '00–Oct. 27, '01, | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| | Shrewsbury. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 20, '00–Dec. 2, '01, . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |
| 1602. July, . . . . | York. | ( ,, ). |
| Sept. 30, . . . . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| 1602-3. Dec. 20, '02–March 24, '03, . . . . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |

## NOTES TO PROVINCIAL VISITS

[1] During 1588-9, the Queen's tumblers, *i.e.* Symons and his company, appeared at Bath and Nottingham.

[2] During 1590 the Queen's tumblers appeared at Bridgnorth and Norwich; at the latter place on April 22, when 'the Turke wente vpon Roppes at Newhall.'

[3] Once the Queen's players acted alone before the Corporation and received a reward, and once with the Earl of Essex's men, the companies receiving a joint reward.

[4] Once the Queen's men acted alone, once with the Earl of Sussex's men, before the Corporation; they were rewarded both times.

[5] Apparently by a mistake, this entry is dated 1593 in the Norwich Chamberlain's Account Books.

[6] They visited Coventry twice this year.

[7] The Queen's company visited Bath twice this year.

## II

## ROBERT DUDLEY, EARL OF LEICESTER'S COMPANY[1]

The first mention of a company of players under the patronage of Lord Robert Dudley, afterward Earl of Leicester, is in his letter of June, 1559, to the Earl of Shrewsbury, then Lord President of the Council of the North.[2] In this letter he asks Shrewsbury's permission for his 'servauntes . . . plaiers of interludes' to perform in Yorkshire. He also states that these players had acted acceptably in London, and had been licensed to play in various parts of England by the lords of those districts.[3]

Armed with their licence and letters of recommendation, the company almost immediately set out on their travels. The general line of their tour can be easily traced by their visits to the following towns:—Norwich (1558-9),[4] Canterbury [*c.* March,

[1] For a second Earl of Leicester's company, cf. ii. 51-52.

[2] G. E. C., *Complete Peerage.*

[3] Cf. ii. 119. This was probably the first dramatic company Lord Robert Dudley had patronised. In addition to the fact that 1559 gives us the first mention of a company under his patronage, it is to be noted that Lord Robert Dudley was more or less in disgrace from 1553 to 1558 owing to his part in the Lady Jane Grey conspiracy. In 1558 he was restored in blood, but did not come into prominence at Court till 1559, after the accession of Elizabeth. Until 1559 his patronage would have been of little value to any dramatic company.

[4] Accounts of this period almost always run from Michaelmas of one year to Michaelmas of the next, *i.e.* from Sept. 29 to Sept. 28. Consequently,

1560], Dover (March 30, 1560), Oxford [after July, 1560], Bristol (August, 1560), and Plymouth [*c.* August, '60].[1] Whether or not they carried out their intended visit to Yorkshire we do not know; at any rate they were in London by Christmas, for on January 21, 1561, they were paid £6, 13s. 4d. for acting at Court.[2]

By March 17, 1561, they were again in the provinces, for on that date they acted in Canterbury, and on March 29, at Dover. From 1561 to 1564 they often visited the provinces under the title of 'Lord Robert Dudley's Players.' During the Christmas festivities of 1562-3 they performed at Court. After Sept. 29, 1564, when Lord Robert Dudley was created Earl of Leicester, his players appeared as the Earl of Leicester's men.[3] From 1564 to 1588, when Leicester died, we find frequent notices of his company in the provinces. With the exception of Christmas, 1581-2, they appeared at Court every Christmas season from 1572-3 to 1582-3.

On May 7, 1574, for the first time, we find the names of the actors in Leicester's company. The privy seal granted them at Greenwich on that date mentions the following players :—'James Burbadge, John Perkyn, John Lanham, William Johnson and Robert Wylson.' This privy seal licenses the company 'To use, exercise and occupie the art and

in this case, Dudley's players were almost certainly in Norwich between June, 1559, when Leicester's letter to the Earl of Shrewsbury was written, and Sept. 28, when the year 1558-9 closed.

[1] Cf. below, 39.

[2] *Ibid.*, 37 *n.*

[3] After 1564 we occasionally find this company referred to as Lord Robert Dudley's players. This is probably due to the carelessness of the Chamberlain, Bailiff, or Mayor, who was responsible for the entry.

faculty of playeing Comedies, Tragedies, Enterludes, Stage playes, . . . together w$^{th}$ there musick,' in London and the provinces, except during common prayer and in time of plague in London. It also requires that all plays presented be approved by the Master of the Revels.[1]

This licence may have been the outcome of a letter to the Earl of Leicester from his players, which is preserved among the MSS. of the Marquis of Bath at Longleat, co. Wilts. In this letter the players state that a 'certayne Proclamacion' is out 'for the revivinge of a Statute as touchinge retayners' and crave permission to continue wearing Leicester's livery and bearing his licence when travelling in the provinces. They sign their names as:—'James Burbage, John Perkinne, John Lañham, Willm̄ Johnson, Roberte Wilson, Thomas Clarke.'[2] This letter is undated, but must have been

[1] Collier, i. 203-204.

[2] Cf. ii. 119-120. This letter is unknown to Collier or Fleay, as is the name of Thomas Clarke, which is not mentioned elsewhere. In an 'old satirical epigram,' referring to the troubles between the city authorities and the players in 1574-5, which Collier, who quotes it (Collier, i. 222), says 'was copied on the fly-leaf of a book, published a few years before the expulsion of the actors from the City into the Liberties' of London, we find two of Leicester's players named, *i.e.* Wilson and Lane[ham]. The verses run as follows:—

'The Fooles of the Cittie.

List unto my dittye,
Alas! the more the pittye,
From Troynovaunts olde cittie
The Aldermen and Maier
Have drivn eche poore plaier:
The cause I will declaer.
They wiselye doe complaine
Of Wilson and Jacke Lane,
And them who doe maintaine;

written before 1583, when Wilson joined the Queen's company,[1] and probably refers to some revival about May, 1574, of the statute of 1572, which insisted that travelling players must be the retainers of some 'Baron of this realm, or . . . other honorable personage of greater degree,' or 'have licence of two justices of the peace at the least.'[2]

In 1575 Leicester's players probably took part in the Earl's celebrated entertainment of Queen Elizabeth at Kenilworth, when many plays and pageants were offered for her amusement.[3] They may also have assisted at the entertainment of Elizabeth in 1578, at Wanstead, the Earl of Leicester's seat in Waltham Forest, when Sir Philip Sidney's interlude was acted before the Queen.[4]

From a MSS. discovered by Mr John Cordy

> And stablishe as a rule
> Not one shall playe the foole
> But they—a worthye scoole.
> Without a pipe and taber,
> They onely meane to laber
> To teche eche oxe-hed neyber.
> This is the cause and reason,
> At every tyme and season,
> That Playes are worse then treason.'

Whether genuine or not (cf. Fleay, *Stage*, 49) the ballad probably indicates correctly the feeling of many Londoners towards the disputes between players and Corporation during 1574-5, and the representative position of Wilson and Laneham among the actors of the city.

[1] Cf. below, 32. [2] Collier, i. 195.

[3] Nichols, *Progresses of Elizabeth*, i. 420 f.; also New Shakespeare Society Pub., iv. 14. It is interesting to note that one of the most detailed accounts of these festivities was written by Robert Laneham, a servant to the Earl of Leicester. Though there is no evidence to connect Robert Laneham with John Laneham, the Earl of Leicester's player, it seems very probable that there was some relationship between them (cf. Nichols, *Progresses of Elizabeth*, i. 422; Collier, i. 225).

[4] Nichols, *Progresses of Elizabeth*, ii. 94.

Jeaffreson, it seems probable that about 1580 John Braynes, the father-in-law of James Burbage, who advanced the money with which the Theatre was built in 1576, was himself an actor and a member of Leicester's company. The MS., which is in Latin, I quote in Mr Jeaffreson's translation :—

'Middlesex, to wit: The jurors for the Lady the Queen present that John Braynes of Shorditche in the county of Middlesex yoman and James Burbage of the same [parish] yoman on the 21st day of February in the 22nd year of the reign of Elizabeth by God's grace Queen of England France and Ireland defender of the faith &c. and on divers other days and occasions before and afterwards brought together and maintained unlawful assemblies of the people to hear and see certain colloquies or interludes called playes or interludes exercised and practised by the same John Braynes and James Burbage and divers other persons unknown at a certain place called the Theatre in Hallywell in the aforesaid county. By reason of which unlawful assembling of the people great affrays assaults tumults and quasi-insurrections and divers other misdeeds and enormities have been then and there done and perpetrated by very many ill-disposed persons to the great disturbance of the peace of the Lady the Queen and the overthrowing of good order and rule and to the danger of the lives of divers good subjects of the said Lady the Queen being there and against the peace of the same Lady the Queen and also against the form of the statute in that respect published and provided &c.'[1]

As Mr Jeaffreson argues, it seems only a fair inference from the words 'plays or interludes exercised and practised by the same John Braynes

[1] John Cordy Jeaffreson, *Middlesex County Records*, 1887, ii. Introd. 46-48. These documents are unnoticed by Fleay.

and James Burbage and divers other persons unknown (playes or interludes per ipsos Johannem Braynes et Jacobum Burbage et diversas alias personas ignotas exercitata et practicata, etc),' that John Braynes was an actor. In this capacity he appears to have been held equally responsible with Burbage for the good conduct of the Theatre, by the Clerk of the Peace in Middlesex, a person who certainly must have known with considerable accuracy the affairs of the Theatre, for he was 'the legal brain of the Justices of the county, and the man of affairs who was bound by official duty to watch narrowly every movement of the populace and every suspicious character in the Middlesex suburbs of London.'[1] That he had before this frequently noticed the unruly conduct about the Theatre, the above indictment shows.[2]

It may be urged 'that in the eye of the law a person is the doer of the things done at his command by his servants.'[3] But this can hardly be regarded as the position of Braynes, for apart from this document, his only known connection with the stage was that of the capitalist who lent Burbage the money to build the Theatre.[4] Besides, even if Braynes were regarded only as the capitalist behind Burbage's venture, it seems unlikely that the words 'exercised and practised' would be used in connection with his name, or that his name would have been placed before Burbage's as that of the more indictable

[1] Jeaffreson, *Middlesex Records*, i. Introd. 48.

[2] For further examples of unruly conduct about the theatres, cf. Jeaffreson, *Middlesex Records*, i. 259; ii. Introd. 46.

[3] *Ibid.*, i. Introd. 48.

[4] The view of Fleay, Halliwell-Phillipps, etc.

person. Neither does it seem strange that in the suits 'Burbage *v.* Braynes,' of 1590, and 'Allen *v.* Burbage,' 1597,[1] Braynes was not mentioned as an actor. For the purposes of evidence in those suits the only fact of importance about Braynes was that he had lent James Burbage money with which to build the Theatre. We may be practically certain, then, that John Braynes was an actor in Leicester's company about 1580.

From 1580 to 1583 the Earl of Leicester's company probably changed little. In 1583 it seems to have lost several of its actors to the new Queen's company, which was then formed by choosing actors out of the leading noblemen's companies at the suggestion of Sir F. Walsingham and with the advice of Edmond Tylney, Master of the Revels.[2] Robt. Wilson, and probably James Burbage, John Laneham and others, left Leicester's men for the new company at this time. The evidence for this transfer of players is:—First, Stow (Howe's additions) tells us that one of the Queen's players chosen in 1583 was Robert Wilson, of 'a quick, delicate, refined, extemporal wit.'[3] If Wilson, then probably other Leicester's men were taken for the Queen's company. Second, John Laneham appears in 1590 as a Queen's player.[4] Between 1583 and 1590 he is not mentioned as connected with any other company. Third, James Burbage, the builder and user of the Theatre and the leader of Leicester's men in 1574,

[1] Halliwell-Phillipps, *Outlines*, 1898, i. 346 f.
[2] Collier, i. 246-247.
[3] Stow (ed. Howes), 1631, 698.
[4] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxii.

continued to hold his interest in the Theatre after 1583, but we find no records of a Leicester's company acting there, though the Queen's frequently did.[1] This points to a connection between Burbage and the Queen's company. Fourth, after 1583 the Queen's company seems to have superseded Leicester's at Court. Leicester's does not appear at Court after Feb. 10, 1583. The Queen's appears yearly, except Christmas, 1586-7, till 1591. Fifth, the company which Leicester recommended to the Court of Denmark in 1585 contained, so far as we know, no players who belonged to Leicester's company before 1583. As the players who went to Denmark were most likely members of Leicester's company after 1583,[2] it is clear that in 1583 Leicester's company must have been almost entirely changed. There is no reason for this change, except that in 1583 many of Leicester's men joined the Queen's company. Sixth, Leicester's company was undoubtedly the most prominent in England from 1572 to 1583,[3] and must have contained several of the best actors of these years. Tylney would certainly advise choosing the best men for the Queen's new company. This evidence seems to show clearly that in 1583 many of Leicester's players, including Robt. Wilson, John Laneham and James Burbage, joined the Queen's company.

Soon after these changes the Earl of Leicester's company must have been reorganised and new actors added, for it appeared during 1584-5 at Leicester,

[1] Halliwell-Phillipps, *Illustrations*, 41.
[2] Cf. below, 34-35.
[3] Cf. Court and Provincial Lists of Leicester's men.

Coventry, Norwich, Dover, Bath, and Gloucester. In 1585 the company seems to have split, many of its important actors going abroad, under the leadership of William Kemp. These proceedings of the company are made clear by the following facts. In the Elsinore monthly pay-roll for 1585 there is an entry of a payment of four skillings to repair a board fence 'which the people broke down the time the English played in the yard.'[1] In 1586 the names of these players are given:—William Kemp (Wilhelm Kempe), Kemp's boy, Daniel Jones (Daniell Jonns), Thomas Stevens (Thomas Stewens), George Bryan (Jurgenn Brienn), Thomas King (Thomas Koning), Thomas Pope (Thomas Pape), Robert Percy (Robert Persy).[2] As this was the only company of English

[1] *New Shakespeareana*, i. 1, Sept. 1901, 16-17. Herz, *Englische Schauspieler und englisches Schauspiel zur Zeit Shakespeares in Deutschland*, 1903, 3.

[2] Herz, 3. Mr. Jacob A. Riis ('Hamlet's Castle,' *Century Magazine*, Jan. 1901, quoted in *New Shakespeareana*, Sept. 1901, 17) adds some interesting details about the players in 1586. William Kemp, instrumentalist (these actors were termed 'instrumentister och springere' in the Elsinore Records, cf. Herz, 3) received 'two months' board for himself and a boy named Daniel Jonns (Jones). He had earned pay from June 17, when he took service. In addition a month's pay was given him as a parting gift. In all three months at 12 dollars per month.' Stevens, Bryan, King, Pope, and Percy, also entered the Danish service on June 17. They remained in that service till Sept. 18. They were paid at the rate of six daler each per month. Thomas Stevens gave his receipt for the payments to the company. Concerning their names, Mr. Riis says, 'The fact that their names are misspelled in the Elsinore ledger does not signify. They afterwards went to Dresden, and there Thomas Stephens, who in Denmark had been Steevens, became T. Stephan; George Bryan, from Jurgenn Brienn in Elsinore, got to be G. Beyzandt; while Pope became Papst. But there they signed their own names on the register beside the German contortions, and identification is made easy. There is no doubt about that part of it; about Koning being Thomas King or Persj being Robert Percy, though the Germans spelled him Rupert Persten.'

Thus has Mr. Fleay's ingenious but unfounded conjecture that Robert

players in Denmark during 1585-6, we have only to learn that Leicester had recommended a company of English players to Frederick II. of Denmark,[1] and that Sir Philip Sidney, writing from Utrecht in March 1586, says that some time before he had sent a letter to his father-in-law, Walsingham, by 'Will [Kemp] the Lord of Leicester's jesting player,'[2] to connect them with the Earl of Leicester's players.

Whether or not the company of English players in Denmark followed Kemp to England during the winter of 1585-6 we do not know. At any rate they were all in Elsinore again by June 17, 1586. On Sept. 25, 1586, they left Denmark to take service at the Court of Saxony. There they remained till July 17, 1587, when they departed for England. As Kemp and Jones are not mentioned as being in Saxony,[3] they may have returned home in the autumn of 1586. All of them, on reaching England, most likely rejoined Lord Leicester's men.[4]

Meanwhile this company, probably reinforced with some new actors in 1585, had been acting in London[5] and the provinces. From 1585-6 to 1588, Sept., they acted at Exeter (1585-6), Abingdon (1586), Dover, Canterbury, Oxford, Marlborough, Southampton, Exeter, Bath, Gloucester, Stratford-on-Avon, Latham (Lancs.), Coventry, Leicester, Norwich, (1586-7), Maidstone, Dover, Plymouth,

Greene was a member of this Company in 1585 been laid to rest once and for all. He conjectured that Rupert Presten of the German MSS. should be read Rupert Priester, and that this was a translation of the English name Robert Person or Parson. This Robert, the parson, being Robert Greene who, he consequently stated, was abroad in 1586 (Fleay, *Stage*, 82).

[1] Heywood, *Apology for Actors* ; cf. Herz, 3.

[2] Cohn, *Shakespeare in Germany*, 1865, 22 ; Herz, 3-4.

[3] Herz, 5-6. [4] Cf. below, 73-75. [5] Collier, i. 257.

Bath, Gloucester, York, Coventry, Norwich, Ipswich (1587-8). During these years we have no records of them in London or at Court. It seems not unlikely that Shakespeare joined these men during their visit to Stratford-on-Avon in 1586-7.[1]

On Sept. 4, 1588, the Earl of Leicester died. His players were, at that time, on tour. They apparently did not hear of their patron's death till after Sept. 14, for on that day they played at Ipswich, as the Earl of Leicester's men. As the Earl of Leicester left no heir, and the Earldom became extinct till the new creation of 1618, the company was forced to break or seek a new patron. What seems to have occurred is, that several of the principal actors in the company joined Lord Strange's men, their places being taken by the discards from Lord Strange's company.[2] This patched-up remanent of Leicester's company must then have sought a new patron, whose name we do not know.[3]

[1] Cf. below, 75. [2] Cf. below, 73-75.

[3] At Faversham in 1589-90 a reward of 13s. 4d. was paid to 'My Lord of Leicester's players.' Possibly the Chamberlain made a mistake in entering the company's name. Perhaps it was the remanent Leicester-Strange company. At any rate there was no authorised company bearing that title after 1588, till 1637. Cf. ii. 52.

## COURT PERFORMANCES

| | |
|---|---|
| 1560-1. Christmas, . . . | ∫(Lord Robert Dudley's players).[1] |
| 1562-3. Christmas, . . . | ( „ ).[2] |
| 1572-3, . . . . . | Two plays. ( „ ).[3] |
| 1573. Dec. 26, . . . | *Predor and Lucia.* ( „ ).[4] |
| 1573. Dec. 28, . . . | *Mamillia* ( „ ).[5] |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1574. Feb. 21, . . . | *Philemon and Philecia.* | (Earl of Leicester's players).[6] |
| 1574. [Dec. 26], . . . | | ( ,, ).[7] |
| 1575. Jan. 1, . . . . | *Panccia.* | ( ,, ).[8] |
| 1575. [Dec. 28], . . . | | ( ,, ).[9] |
| 1576. Dec. 30, . . . | *The History of the Collier.* | ( ,, ).[10] |
| 1577-8. Christmas, . . . | | ( ,, ).[11] |
| 1579. Jan. 4, . . . . | *A Pastoral or a History of a Greek Maid.* | ( ,, ).[12] |
| 1579. [Jan. 6], . . . | [*The History of the Rape of the Second Helen*] | ( ,, ).[13] |
| 1580. Jan. 6, . . . . | *The History of* ——. | ( ,, ).[14] |
| 1580. Dec. 26, . . . | *Delight.* | ( ,, ).[15] |
| 1581. Feb. 7, . . . | *A Story of* ——. | ( ,, ).[16] |
| 1583. Feb. 10, . . . | *A History of Telomo.* | ( ,, ).[17] |

## NOTES TO COURT PERFORMANCES

[1] Cunningham, *Revels at Court*, xxvii ; Fleay, *Stage*, 15. For this performance the company was paid on Jan. 21, £6, 13s. 4d. Fleay (*Stage*, 33, 58) conjectures that the play acted was the *Disobedient Child*. Later (*Drama*, i. 307), he changes his mind, guessing that the *Disobedient Child* was acted March 6, 1560-1, by the children of Paul's. Both conjectures are unsupported by evidence.

[2] Chalmers, *Apology*, 394 ; Fleay, *Stage*, 15. The Company was paid £6, 13s. 4d. on Jan. 10, 1563. Concerning the play acted at this performance, Fleay's conjectures are contradictory and unsupported by evidence. On page 33 (*Stage*) he conjectures the play to have been *King Darius*. On page 59 (*Stage*), speaking of that play, he says it 'was probably an old interlude, revived possibly at Christmas, 1563-4.' As there is no recorded performance at Court by Leicester's men, 1563-4, the above statements are contradictory. Furthermore, on page 58 (*Stage*), speaking of *Diccon of Bedlam*, probably the earlier name of *Gammer Gurton's Needle* (*Stage*, 58 ; *Drama*, ii. 253 ; Manly, *Specimens of Pre-Shaksperean Drama*, ii. 93) he says, 'As we find in *Martin's Month's Mind*, 1589, that it (*i.e. Gammer Gurton's Needle*) belonged to 'Lanham and his fellows,' there can be no hesitation in assigning it to Leicester's men. Its anteriority of publication to any other play but one of theirs almost compels us to give the date of the Court performance as 1562-3.' This must mean that he thinks *Diccon of Bedlam* (*i.e. Gammer Gurton's Needle*) was the play acted at Court by Leicester's men during Christmas, 1562-3 ;

a flat contradiction of the *King Darius* guess. There is one more contradiction. On page 33 (*Stage* ; cf. also 380) he enters '1564-5, Xmas. [Gammer Gurton],' as performed by Leicester's men. Now, there is no record of a Court performance by Leicester's men during Christmas, 1564-5, and as we have seen above (cf. *Stage*, 58 ; *Drama*, ii. 253) Fleay assigns *Gammer Gurton's Needle* to Leicester's men at Court, Christmas, 1562-3. The fact is, there is no evidence to show what play Leicester's men performed at Court, Christmas, 1562-3.

[3] Cunningham, *Revels*, 41 ; Fleay, *Stage*, 20. Under the date 1567-8, Christmas, Fleay (*Stage*, 33) enters a performance at Court by Leicester's men. The only evidence for this assertion is that during Christmas, 1567-8, seven plays were acted at Court (*Stage*, 17). There is, however, nothing to indicate which companies acted these plays. This Fleay recognises in his *English Drama* (ii. 288).

[4] Malone by Boswell, iii. 375 ; Fleay, *Stage*, 21.

[5] Malone by Boswell, iii. 375 ; Fleay, *Stage*, 21. The two plays by Leicester's men, Christmas, 1573-4, were paid for on Jan. 7, 1574 ; the amount being £13, 6s. 8d., plus a reward of £6, 13s. 4d. (Malone by Boswell, iii. 445).

[6] Malone by Boswell, iii. 379 ; Fleay, *Stage*, 22. On Feb. 22, 1573-4, the company was paid £6, 13s. 4d., and given a reward of £3, 6s. 8d. (Malone by Boswell, iii. 446).

[7] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxx, 88 ; Fleay, *Stage*, 22-23. Some items of expenditure for this performance are to be found in the disbursements of the Revels Office on Dec. 27 (Cunningham, *Revels*, 88). Collier is almost certainly wrong in supposing that this performance was by a company of boys under the Earl of Leicester's patronage (Collier, i. 226). We find elsewhere no mention of a Leicester's boys' company, and the entry naturally enough refers to the boys in Leicester's men's company (Fleay, *Stage*, 23). The company received £10 for the performance (Cunningham, *Revels*, xxx.).

[8] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxx, 88 ; Fleay, *Stage*, 22-23. This play was rehearsed on Dec. 18 (Cunningham, *Revels*, 87). The company was paid on Jan. 9, £6, 13s. 4d. for the performance.

[9] Chalmers, *Apology*, 395 ; Fleay, *Stage*, 24. The conjecture that this performance was on Dec. 28 is Fleay's, and is probably correct. The payment of £10 for the play was made on Dec. 29, 1575. Chalmers, quoting from the Council Register, states that the play was on Candlemas Day, *i.e.* Feb. 2 (*Apology*, 395, copied Malone by Boswell, iii. 446), but as Fleay points out, Paul's boys under S. Westcott performed on Candlemas, 1575. That there were two performances on Candlemas Day is possible (cf. 1579, Jan. 4, in Fleay, *Stage*, 26). The delay of payment from Feb. 2 to Dec. 29, however, seems very unlikely. Probably there is a mistake either in Chalmers or the Register.

[10] Cunningham, *Revels*, 102, Fleay, *Stage*, 24. The play was paid for on Jan. 20, 1577, the amount being £6, 13s. 4d. (Chalmers, *Apology*, 395).

[11] Chalmers, *Apology*, 396; Fleay, *Stage*, 25. The company was paid £6, 13s. 4d., and granted a reward of £3, 6s. 8d. on Jan. 9, 1578.

[12] Collier, i. 232; Fleay, *Stage*, 26.

[13] Collier, i. 233; Fleay, *Stage*, 26. Fleay is undoubtedly right in assigning *The History of the Rape of the Second Helen*, performed at Richmond on Twelfth Day to Leicester's men. All other plays are assigned to their respective companies, and Leicester's men are paid for two plays, though only the *History of a Greek Maid* is spoken of as performed by them. They were paid for both plays on Jan. 16, 1579 (Chalmers, *Apology*, 396).

[14] Cunningham, *Revels*, 154-155; Fleay, *Stage*, 27-28. The company were paid £10, which included the reward, on Jan. 25, 1580 (Chalmers, *Apology*, 397). Leicester's men were all ready to perform the play before the Queen at Whitehall on Innocent's Day, *i.e.* Dec. 28, 1589, but 'the Queenes Ma^tie could not come forth to heare the same,' so the play was 'put of.'

[15] Cunningham, *Revels*, 167; Fleay, *Stage*, 28. Payment of £10 was made on Jan. 20, 1581 (Chalmers, *Apology*, 398).

[16] Cunningham, *Revels*, 168; Fleay, *Stage*, 29. Payment of £6, 13s. 4d. and £3, 6s. 8d. reward, was made on Feb. 13, 1581 (Chalmers, *Apology*, 398). Fleay has omitted this performance from his list of Court plays on page 33, *Stage*.

[17] Cunningham, *Revels*, 177; Fleay, *Stage*, 30. There is no entry of a payment for this play.

## PROVINCIAL VISITS

(Lord Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, 1564. Sept. 29–1588. Sept. 4.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1558-9, . . . . . | Norwich. | (Lord Robert Dudley's players). |
| 1559-60. [*c.* March, '60], . . | Canterbury. | ( ,, ). |
| March 30, '60, . . . | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| [After July 8, '60], . . | Oxford. | ( ,, ). |
| August, '60, . . . | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |
| [*c.* Aug., '60], . . . | Plymouth. | ( ,, ). |
| 1560-61. March 17, '61, . . | Canterbury. | ( ,, ). |
| March 29, '61, . . . | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| 1561-2. May 5, '62, . . | Canterbury. | ( ,, ). |
| *c.* June 17, '62, . . | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| [After June 8, '62], . . | Oxford. | ( ,, ). |

| | |
|---|---|
| Sept., '62, . . . . | Bristol. (Lord Robert Dudley's players). |
| | Gloucester. ( ,, ). |
| | Ipswich. ( ,, ). |
| 1562-3. [After May 28, '63], . | Ipswich. ( ,, ). |
| | Norwich. ( ,, ). |
| 1563-4. Nov. 12, '63, . . | Leicester. ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 18, '63, . . . | Ipswich. ( ,, ). |
| | Norwich. ( ,, ). |
| Jan. 2 and 3, '64, . . | Ipswich. ( ,, ). |
| April 22, '64, . . . | Dover. ( ,, ). |
| [*c.* April, '64], . . . | Canterbury. ( ,, ). |
| July 1, '64, . . . | Leicester. ( ,, ). |
| 1564-5, . . . . . | Norwich. (Earl of Leicester's players). |
| 1565. April 6, . . . . | York. ( ,, ). |
| 1565-6, . . . . . | Norwich. ( ,, ). |
| 1566-7. Autumn, '67, . . | Canterbury. ( ,, ). |
| 1568-9. Aug. 11, '69, . . | Nottingham. ( ,, ). |
| 1569-70. January, '70, . . | Bristol. ( ,, ). |
| | Gloucester. ( ,, ). |
| [*c.* April, '70], . . . | Canterbury. ( ,, ). |
| | Dover. ( ,, ). |
| | Maidstone. ( ,, ). |
| | Abingdon. ( ,, ). |
| May 4, '70, . . . | Oxford. ( ,, ). |
| 1569-70. [*c.* July, '70], . . | Plymouth. ( ,, ). |
| | Southampton. ( ,, ). |
| 1570-71. April 30, '71, . . | Gloucester. ( ,, ). |
| | Barnstaple. ( ,, ). |
| | Leicester. ( ,, ). |
| | Saffron Walden. ( ,, ). |
| 1571, . . . . . | Beverley (Yorks.). ( ,, ). |
| 1571-2. July 15, '72, . . | Ipswich. ( ,, ). |
| Aug. 20, '72, . . . | Nottingham. ( ,, ). |
| | Leicester. ( ,, ). |
| 1572-3. Aug. 8, '73, . . . | Beverley (Yorks.). ( ,, ). |
| Sept. 1, '73, . . . | Nottingham. ( ,, ). |
| 1573, . . . . . | Stratford-on-Avon. ( ,, ). |
| 1573-4. Oct. '73, . . . | Bristol. ( ,, ). |
| | Oxford. ( ,, ). |
| [After Aug. 2, '74], . . | Doncaster. ( ,, ). |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Leicester. (Earl of Leicester's players.) |
| 1574-5. Dec. 3, '74, . . . | Canterbury. ( ,, ). |
| | Southampton. ( ,, ). |
| 1575-6, . . . . . | Ipswich. (Lord Robert Dudley's players). |
| 1576-7. Autumn, '77, . . | Canterbury. (Earl of Leicester's players). |
| Sept. 22, '77, . . . | Southampton. ( ,, ). |
| | Exeter. ( ,, ). |
| 1577, . . . . . | Stratford-on-Avon. ( ,, ). |
| 1577-8. Early Oct., '77, . . | Bristol. ( ,, ). |
| | Bath. ( ,, ). |
| Oct., '77, . . . . | Exeter. ( ,, ). |
| Sept. 10, '78, . . . | Ipswich. ( ,, ). |
| 1578-9, . . . . . | Dover. ( ,, ). |
| [*c.* 1579. Nov. 3 or 4], . . | Kertling (Suffolk). ( ,, ). |
| 1579-80. Spring, '80, . . | Canterbury. ( ,, ). |
| | Ipswich. ( ,, ). |
| May 15-17, '80, . . . | Kertling (Suffolk). ( ,, ). |
| [*c* June, '80], . . . | Cambridge. ( ,, ). |
| | Coventry. ( ,, ). |
| 1580, . . . . . | Fordwich. ( ,, ). |
| 1580-1, . . . . . | Norwich. ( ,, ). |
| 1581-2, . . . . . | Winchester. ( ,, ). |
| | Southampton. ( ,, ). |
| | Coventry. ( ,, ). |
| 1582-3, . . . . . | Coventry.[1] ( ,, ). |
| 1584-5. [After Jan. 1, '85],. . | Leicester. ( ,, ). |
| | Coventry. ( ,, ). |
| | Norwich. ( ,, ). |
| June 12-16, '85, . . . | Dover.[2] ( ,, ). |
| June 17, '84–June 16, '85, . | Bath. (Lord Dudley's players). |
| | Gloucester. (Earl of Leicester's players). |
| Aug., '85, . . . . | Bath. ( ,, ). |
| 1585-6. March 23, '86, . . | Exeter. ( ,, ). |
| 1586, . . . . . | Abingdon. ( ,, ). |

[1] Accompanied by the Earl of Leicester's musicians.
[2] Apparently playing with the Lord Admiral's players.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1586-7. March 4, '87, . . | Dover. | (Earl of Leicester's players). |
| [*c.* March, '87], . . . | Canterbury. | ( ,, ). |
| | Oxford. | ( ,, ). |
| | Marlborough. | ( ,, ). |
| [*c.* March, '87], . . . | Southampton. | ( ,, ). |
| | Exeter. | ( ,, ). |
| June 14, '86–June 14, '87, . | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| | Stratford-on-Avon. | ( ,, ). |
| July 11, 12, 13, '87, . . | Latham Ho.(Lancs.). | ( ,, ). |
| July, '87, . . . . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| Aug. 1, '87, . . . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| 1587-8. Jan. 23, '88, . . | Maidstone. | ( ,, ). |
| Feb. 3–March 2, '88, . . | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| May 15, '88, . . . | Plymouth. | ( ,, ). |
| June 15, '87–June 18, '88, . | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| June 17, '88, . . . | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| July 13, '88, . . . | York. | ( ,, ). |
| | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| Sept. 4, '88, . . . | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| Sept. 14, '88, . . . | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |
| 1589-90, . . . . | Faversham. | ( ,, ). |

## III

### 1. EARL OF WORCESTER'S COMPANY[1]

The earliest notice of a dramatic company under the patronage of an Earl of Worcester occurs in the Barnstaple Records for 1555, when such a company played in Barnstaple and were paid 6s. 8d. by the town. At this time William Somerset was Earl of Worcester. Till his death on Feb. 21, 1589, he seems to have patronised a company of players, which is mentioned almost yearly in the provincial records. In June, 1583, we learn, for the first time, some details about the construction of this company.[2] They then appeared in Norwich and craved licence to play in that city. This was refused them, 'as well to avoyd the meetynge of people this whote wheth^r for fear of any infeccon as also for that they came fro an Infected place, etc.' Nevertheless, for their Lord and Master's sake they were given a reward of 26s. 8d. They promised to leave the city, but instead proceeded to their inn and played there. The Mayor and his Court, angered by this conduct, ordered that the Earl of Worcester should be notified of it, that the players should never again receive a reward from the city, and that they should leave Norwich at once, on pain of imprisonment.

[1] For second Worcester company, cf. ii. 98.

[2] Cf. ii. 336.

But, on the company's submission and earnest entreaty, the Mayor and Court agreed not to inform the Earl of Worcester of their conduct. The account of this affair, entered in the Mayor's Court Book of Norwich on June 7, 1583, states that the company consisted of ten players, including the following :—

> 'James Tunstall [*i.e.* Dunstan].
> Thomas Cook.
> Edward Brown.
> Willm Harryson.'

In the following March, *i.e.* 1584,[1] we find this company quarrelling with the Leicester authorities. It seems that on March 3, 1584, a company calling themselves the 'servants of the Queen's Majesty's Master of the Revels,' presented their licence to the town council of Leicester and asked permission to play. On the 6th of March the Earl of Worcester's company appeared at Leicester, and found at their inn the box and licence of the Master of the Revels company, which had been forgotten. These they appropriated, and presented the licence to the Leicester magistrates as their own, saying that the other company had stolen it from them. But the authorities were not to be hoodwinked, and so Worcester's men were forced to present their own licence. The Mayor refused to allow them to play, but gave them an angel towards their dinner. Two hours later the players met Mr. Mayor in the street, and again asked leave to play at their inn. They were again refused. Then, after abusing the

[1] Cf. ii. 320 f.

Mayor with 'evyll & contemptyous words,' they left him, saying that they would play whether 'he wold or not,' and went with 'drum & Trumppytts thorowe the Towne, in contempt of M^r^ Mayor.' Soon after, however, they came to the Mayor, craving pardon, and begging that he would not write to the Earl of Worcester against them. So, on promising as an introduction to their play an apology for their conduct, and a statement that they were only allowed to play by Mr. Mayor's good will and permission, they got leave to play that night at their inn.

In the account of this dispute is an abstract of the licence of the Earl of Worcester's men. It is dated '14 of Januarye A° 25° Eliz. R^e^,' *i.e.* 1583, and gives the following list of the company :—

'Rob^t^ Browne.
James Tunstall [*i.e.* Dunstan].
Edward Allen.
W^m^. Harryson.
Tho. Cooke.
Ryc. Johnes.
Edward Browne.
Ryc. Andrewes.'

When the company visited Leicester, in March, 1584, it contained probably, in addition to these men :—

'W^m^. Pateson my lord Harbards man.
Tho. Powlton my lord of Worcesters man.'[1]

The connection of 'my lord Harbard's man' with

[1] Cf. ii. 321.

the Earl of Worcester's company is easily explained, for 'lord Harbard' is undoubtedly Edward Somerset, Lord Herbert, the eldest son of the Earl of Worcester. He also had in his patronage a company of players.[1] Sometimes an actor of one company travelled temporarily with another company, as did Edward Alleyn, a Lord Admiral's man, with Lord Strange's company in 1593.[2] Consequently, it is not surprising to find the Earl of Worcester's men assisted by a player from Lord Herbert's company.

Whether Edward Alleyn joined the Earl of Worcester's players in 1583, or had been a member of that company before 1583, we cannot say. At any rate it is interesting to notice that Edward Alleyn, though at this time only a little over sixteen years of age[3] was placed third in the 1583 list of Worcester's men.

There is some probability that John Alleyn, the elder brother of Edward Alleyn, was an actor, and connected with the Earl of Worcester's company about 1588-9. In November, 1580, he was styled servant to 'the Lord Sheffeilde,'[4] and in 1589-90, 'servant' to the Lord Admiral.[5] As the term 'servant' was commonly used for 'player,' and on Jan. 3, 1589, we find him mentioned as part owner with Edward Alleyn, Robert Browne, and Richard Jones, all players, of 'playinge apparell, playe books,

[1] Cf. ii. 87. [2] Cf. below, 114.

[3] Alleyn was born Sept. 1, 1566; cf. Collier, *Memoirs of Edward Alleyn*, Shak. Soc. Pub., 1841, 3.

[4] Collier, *Alleyn Papers*, Shak. Soc. Pub., 1853, 1; also Warner, *Catalogue*, 3, 123.

[5] Collier, *Alleyn Papers*, Shak. Soc. Pub., 1853, 4-5; also Warner, *Catalogue*, 85, 86, 123.

instrumentes, etc.,[1] it seems likely that he was a player. Moreover, as Edward Alleyn, Robert Browne, and Richard Jones were probably still members of the Earl of Worcester's company about Jan. 3, 1589, there is every likelihood that John Alleyn was also a member of that company about Jan. 3, 1589. If so, he must have joined Worcester's men after Jan. 14, 1583, as he is not mentioned in the list of the company on that date. Possibly soon after the company's quarrel at Leicester in 1584, William Pateson rejoined his own company, Lord Herbert's players, and John Alleyn took his place in the Earl of Worcester's company.

This Earl of Worcester's company seems to have undergone no important changes till about Jan. 3, 1589, when Edward Alleyn, John Alleyn (if an actor), and probably James Tunstall (*i.e.* Dunstan), appear to have left the company for the Lord Admiral's men. The evidence for this change is, (*a*) Edward Alleyn, on Jan. 3, 1589, bought Richard Jones's share of the theatrical stock owned by Edward Alleyn, J. Alleyn, R. Browne, and R. Jones.[2] If Edward Alleyn and his brother were thinking of joining the Admiral's men, this transaction would give them three shares of the four owned by the above men in Worcester's company, probably no inconsiderable amount of theatrical properties to bring to the new company. (*b*) It is in December, 1589, that we find the first indication of that connection between the Lord Admiral and the Alleyns, which lasted for so many years. On that date the Lord Admiral wrote a

[1] Collier, *Memoirs of Edward Alleyn*, Shak. Soc. Pub., 1841, 198 ; also ii. 121-122.

[2] Cf. ii. 121-122.

letter of recommendation to the Lords of the Privy Council for his 'servaunte' John Alleyn.[1] (*c*) James Tunstall or Dunstan seems to have been closely connected with the Alleyns from 1588 to 1594. On Jan. 23, 1588, he was an appraiser of Richard Browne's property, for John Alleyn;[2] in Nov., 1590, he was a witness to the buying of a cloak and robe from Isaac Burgess by John Alleyn;[3] on May 6, 1592, he was a witness to the purchase of a cloak from John Cliff by John and Edward Alleyn,[4] and in Dec., 1594, he appeared with Edward Alleyn as a player in the Lord Admiral's company.[5] If, then, Edward Alleyn, John Alleyn, and James Tunstall or Dunstan left Worcester's men for the Lord Admiral's about January, 1589, it would account for the fact that when in 1593 Edward Alleyn was acting with Lord Strange's men, he is carefully differentiated from the other actors in that company, by being called the 'servant to the Lord High Admiral.'[6]

On Feb. 21, 1589, William Somerset, Earl of Wor-

[1] Cf above, 46. [2] Warner, *Catalogue*, 125.
[3] *Ibid.*, 3. [4] *Ibid.*, 4. [5] Cf. below, 188.

[6] Cf. below, 88. Mr. Fleay considers that the Earl of Worcester's company was dissolved about Jan., 1589, and then passed under the patronage of the Earl of Pembroke (*Stage*, 82, 87). His evidence for this dissolution of Worcester's men in 1589 is based on a misstatement of the facts which he gives thus:—'On 3rd January 1589 Alleyn bought up for this company [*i.e.* Lord Strange's] the share of the playbooks, properties, &c., which had belonged to Richard Jones, Robert Browne, John Alleyn, and, of course, retained his own share. They had all four been members in 1586 of Worcester's company, which by 3rd January 1589 had been dissolved.' What E. Alleyn really did was to buy Richard Jones's share of the theatrical properties owned by Edward Alleyn, John Alleyn, Robert Browne, and Richard Jones. This transaction is certainly insufficient evidence to establish a dissolution of Worcester's company. Moreover, there is plenty of evidence that Worcester's company continued to act after Jan. 3, 1589 (cf. later history of the company). This is enough to refute Fleay's guess that Worcester's men became in 1589, Pembroke's men.

cester, died. His company of players seems to have passed under the patronage of his son, Edward Somerset, who succeeded to the Earldom, for between Oct. 30 and Nov. 22, 1590, a Worcester company appeared in Leicester.[1] During the next few years there are many references to this company in the provinces. In the late summer or early autumn of 1590 the Earl of Worcester's company, either as a whole or in part, visited the Netherlands under the leadership of Robert Browne, as the following item in the town accounts of Leyden shows: 'Paid to Robert Browne, Englishman, and to his fellows, in all fifteen guilders, over and above the sum of the like amount, granted to him for having acted and played divers comedies and histories, besides for having made divers leaps, by him performed as well in the presence of the burgomasters as before the community of this city, as appears by order of date, Oct. vii, 1590. xv guilders.'[2] Soon after this payment these men returned to England, for between Oct. 30 and Nov. 22, 1590, they acted at Leicester.

During 1591 the Earl of Worcester's company acted at Faversham, Norwich, Coventry, Leicester, Marlborough, Gloucester, Shrewsbury, and Southampton. Toward the end of this year, or the beginning of 1592, Robert Browne and Richard Jones planned to go abroad with the company. This is shown in a letter which Jones wrote to

[1] Edward Somerset, who was styled Lord Herbert from 1550 to 1589, had a company of players known as Lord Herbert's men. There is no record of these men after 1584. (Cf. ii. 87.)

[2] Cohn, *Shakespeare in Germany*, etc., xxxi, xxxii; Herz, 7.

Edward Alleyn, his old comrade of the Worcester company from 1583 to 1589. This letter is undated, but as we know Browne and Jones were on the Continent soon after Feb. 1592, it undoubtedly was written shortly before that time. The letter runs as follows :—

'M^r Allen, I commend my love and humble duty to you, geving you thankes for yo^r great bounty bestoed upon me in my sicknes, when I was in great want: god blese you for it. Sir, this it is, I am to go over beyond the seeas w^t Mr. Browne and the company, but not by his meanes, for he is put to half a shaer, and to stay hear, for they ar all against his going: now, good Sir, as you have ever byne my worthie frend, so helpe me nowe. I have a sute of clothes and a cloke at pane fo^r three pound, and if it shall pleas you to lend me so much to release them, I shall be bound to pray fo^r you so long as I leve; for if I go over, and have no clothes, I shall not be esteemed of; and, by gods help, the first mony that I gett I will send it over unto you, for hear I get nothinge: sometimes I have a shillinge a day, and some tymes nothinge, so that I leve in great poverty hear, and so humbly take my leave, prainge to god, I and my wiffe, for yo^r health and Mistris Allene's, which god continew.

Yo^r poor frend to command,

Richard Jones.'[1]

Just what is meant by Jones's words about Robert Browne being 'put to half a shaer, etc.' is doubtful. In the light of what appears to have happened, they probably mean that those of the company who did not intend going abroad objected

[1] Collier, *Alleyn Papers*, 19. This letter corroborates the opinion that Edward Alleyn left the Earl of Worcester's company in 1589, for it shows clearly that in 1591, if not before, Alleyn was not in the same company as Richard Jones, *i.e.* Worcester's men.

to Robert Browne, in all likelihood their head player, leaving them, and reduced his part in their profits to half a share, so that he might not have the means to fit out a company for abroad. But Browne was not to be deterred, and left for the Continent with part of the company soon after Feb. 10, 1592. From a passport granted them on Feb. 10, 1592, by Charles Howard, Lord Admiral, we learn that their names were :—

Robert Browne.
John Bradstreet.
Thomas Saxfield (*i.e.* Sackville).
Richard Jones.

We also learn that they intended playing in Zealand, Holland, Friesland, and Germany.[1] It is pleasant to think that Edward Alleyn, in addition to the three pounds which he lent Richard Jones to redeem his clothes from pawn,[2] may have interceded with the Lord Admiral, probably then his patron, on behalf of his friends, Robert Browne and Richard Jones, and that the passport recommending them to the good graces of the authorities abroad was the result.

After reaching the Continent, Browne and his comrades first appeared at Wolfenbüttel. Thence, in August, they went to Frankfurt. In October and November they were at Köln, and in August, 1593, at Nürnberg. By the end of August, 1593, they were back in Frankfurt.[3] Soon after this Browne and Jones seem to have returned to England, for we hear nothing more of Browne on the Continent

[1] Cf. ii. 120-121.
[2] Warner, *Catalogue*, 5.
[3] Herz, 5-12.

till 1596, when he was at Cassel,[1] and on Sept. 2, 1594, Jones bought some playing apparel from Henslowe.[2] The rest of the company remained in Germany and entered the service of Count Moritz von Hessen.[3]

Meanwhile the Earl of Worcester's company, which remained in England, probably filled its ranks with actors to take the place of Browne, Jones, Sackville, and Breadstreet, who never again appeared as Worcester's men. This company continued to act in the provinces till 1602, when it was probably reorganised and appeared in London. On August 17, 1602, the Earl of Worcester's company began to act at the Rose under Henslowe's management.[4] We have no full list of the actors in this company, for when they closed their account with Henslowe up to March 16, 1603, instead of the various members signing their names, only Thomas Blackwood, as the representative of the company, signed.[5] But from Henslowe's business transactions with the company, from Aug. 17, 1602, to March 16, 1603, a fairly complete list of its actors can be made out.[6] Their names are :—

John Duke.
William Kempe.
Christopher Beeston.

[1] Herz, 5-12. [2] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 29. [3] Herz, 13.
[4] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 179. [5] *Ibid.*, 190.
[6] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 179-190. Possibly Dick Syferweste (*Ibid.*, 178) was a member of Worcester's company in Sept. 1602. This seems improbable though, because the entry in the *Diary* indicates that Syferweste's 'felowes' were acting in the country, and there is nothing to show that Worcester's company had left London at this time. (Fleay, *Stage*, 138, states that Syferweste was a Pembroke's man. There is no evidence for this statement.)

Robert Pallant.
Thomas Blackwood.
John Thayer.
John Lowin.
—— Cattanes [Katherines].
Richard Perkins,
Thomas Heywood.

Duke, Kempe, Beeston, and Pallant probably joined this company from the Lord Chamberlain's men not long before it opened at the Rose in August, 1602;[1] about the same time Heywood seems to have joined the company from either the Lord Admiral's or Earl of Derby's players,[2] and Blackwood, Thayer, Lowin, Cattanes, and Perkins were most likely Worcester's men before August, 1602.[3] That Heywood was connected with Worcester's company as an actor as well as a playwright is certain, for it is as an actor that he appears in the list of this company when they passed under the patronage of Queen Anne in 1603,[4] and in an entry in Henslowe's *Diary*, undated, but from its position probably belonging to 1602, the manager lends Heywood 2s. 6d. to 'bye hime a payer of sylke garters,' evidently to be used in acting.[5]

That this reorganisation of the Earl of Worcester's company took place before 1602 is unlikely, for (*a*) Kempe was apparently a member of the Lord Chamberlain's company till late in 1601, and

[1] Cf. ii. 125 f. Also for a discussion of Mr. Fleay's opinion as to the formation of the Earl of Worcester's company in 1602.

[2] Cf. ii. 141 f.

[3] They are not mentioned as connected with Pembroke's or any other company before 1602.

[4] Cf. below, 185.

[5] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 178.

probably Kempe, Duke, Beeston, and Pallant left the Lord Chamberlain's company for the Earl of Worcester's company at the same time,[1] and (*b*) there is no record of the Earl of Worcester's company acting in London before 1602. It was, no doubt, in contemplation of a London season in 1602 that the company was reorganised.

In Henslowe's *Diary*[2] we find the following entries, which probably refer to the Earl of Worcester's company acting outside of London before its reorganisation :—

> 'Lent the 12 of marche 1602 vnto Thomas blackwode when he Ride into the contrey w^th^ his company to playe in Redy mony the some of . . . . x^s^'
>
> 'Lent vnto John lowyn the 12 of marche 160[1]2 when he went into the contrey w^th^ the company to playe in Redy mony the some of . . . . v^s^'
>
> 1602
> 'Lent vnto Rychard perckyns the 12 of marche when he Rid w^th^ the company to playe in the con trey in Redy mony the some of . . . . x^s^'

Accordingly, the reorganisation of the company most likely took place between March 12 and Aug. 17, 1602.

The company began to act in London in 1602 at the Boar's Head in Eastcheap, as we learn from a letter of the Lords of the Council to the Lord Mayor permitting the servants of the Earls of Oxford and Worcester to play at that house.[3] On August 17, 1602, Worcester's men opened at the Rose, where

[1] Cf. ii. 125 f.
[2] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 177-178.
[3] Index to *Remembrancia*, 1878, 355.

they continued to act till March 16, 1603.[1] On May 9 they again began playing at the Rose. As under this date there is only one payment for them in the *Diary*, and then the account ceases abruptly, leaving eight inches of the page blank, there can be little doubt that they stopped acting at the Rose almost immediately.[2] Possibly they returned to the Boar's Head, which is mentioned in the rough, undated draft of their authorisation by King James as one of their usual playing places.[3] At any rate they did not act long in London, for by May 26 the weekly death-rate from the plague had risen to thirty, and the theatres were closed.[4] Worcester's men travelled in the provinces, appearing at Leicester, Coventry, and Barnstaple.[5] The plague remained severe till

[1] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 178-190.

[2] *Ibid.*, 190. The company's reason for leaving the Rose may have been their uncertainty as to the fate of that playhouse. On June 25, 1603, Henslowe wrote in his *Diary*, 'Memorandom that the 25 of June 1603 J talked w^th^ mr Pope at the scryveners shope wher he lisse consernynge the [ta] tackynge of the leace a new of the littell Roosse & he showed me a wrytynge betwext the pareshe & hime seallfe w^ch^ was to paye twenty pownd a yeare Rent & to bestowe a hundred marckes vpon billdinge w^ch^ J sayd J wold Rather pulle downe the playehowse then J wold do so & [b] he beade me do & sayd he gaue me leaue & wold beare me owt for yt wasse [h] in hime to do yt' (*Diary*, ed. Greg, 178). The Rose, however, was not then pulled down, though there are no records of plays being acted there after 1603 (Warner, *Catalogue*, 192). 'Mr. Pope' was probably Mr. Morgan Pope, not Thomas Pope, the actor (cf. Collier, *Alleyn Papers*, xvii.; *Stage*, 149).

[3] Cf. below, 185.

[4] Cf. ii. 185.

[5] Mr. Fleay conjectures that Worcester's men acted at the Rose till *c.* 1604 (*Stage*, 201). This conjecture he seems to contradict when, in another place, he states that they acted at the Curtain 1603 to 1609 (*Stage*, 191). There is certainly no evidence to show that they acted at the Rose after May 9, 1603. If they acted at the Curtain during 1603 it must have been between May 9 and May 26. As I have stated above, it seems more likely, if they did act in London after May 9, that it was at their former playing place, the Boar's Head, as there is no mention of them at the Curtain till 1604.

Dec. 22, and the theatres were not reopened till early in 1604, when the Earl of Worcester's company had passed under the patronage of Queen Anne.[1]

## PROVINCIAL VISITS

(William Somerset, Earl of Worcester, 1549, Nov. 26–1589, Feb. 21.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| After 1547-8. Year uncertain, | Hedon (Yorks).[2] | (Earl of Worcester's players). |
| 1555, | Barnstaple. | ( ,, ). |
| 1562-3. July, '63, | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |
| 1563-4. Jan., '64, | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |
| | Plymouth. | ( ,, ). |
| 1564-5. Autumn, '64, | Canterbury. | ( ,, ). |
| 1565-6, | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| 1566-7. [Before May 13, '67], | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| 1567-8. Nov., '67, | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |
| | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| | Winchester. | ( ,, ). |
| June 11, '68, | Plymouth. | ( ,, ). |
| 1568-9. Nov., '68, | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| [*c.* Dec.], '68, | Canterbury. | ( ,, ). |
| Aug. 11, '69, | Nottingham. | ( ,, ). |
| | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |
| Sept., '69, | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |
| [June], 1568–June 8, '69, | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| | Stratford-on-Avon. | ( ,, ). |
| 1570-1. *c.* Dec. 25, '70, | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |
| Feb. 6, '71, | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| [*c.* Midsummer, '71], | Plymouth. | ( ,, ). |
| | Barnstaple. | ( ,, ). |

[1] Gilbert Dugdale, *The Time Triumphant*; cf. for an Earl of Worcester's provincial company, *c.* 1620, below, ii. 98.

[2] If the date of this visit to Hedon be before Nov. 26, 1549, the company's patron was Henry Somerset, Earl of Worcester, the predecessor of William Somerset, Earl of Worcester. The probabilities are, however, that this visit did not occur till after 1555.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1571, . . . . . | Beverley. | (Earl of Worcester's players). |
| 1571-2. Jan. 9, '72, . . | Nottingham. | ( ,, ). |
| | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| 1572-3. Dec. 1, '92, . . . | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| Jan. 6, '93, . . . | Nottingham. | ( ,, ). |
| | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| *c.* end Jan., '93, . . | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |
| [May], '92–May 20, '93, . | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| | Plymouth. | ( ,, ). |
| Dec., '92–March, '93, . . | Canterbury. | ( ,, ). |
| 1573, . . . . . | Abingdon. | ( ,, ). |
| 1573-4. Jan., '74, . . . | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |
| | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| 1574-5. Xmas to New Year, . | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |
| April 18, '75, . . . | Nottingham. | ( ,, ). |
| 1575-6. Nov. 28, '75–Oct. 25, '76, | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| [Before Jan. 1, '76], . . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| 1576, . . . . . | Stratford-on-Avon. | ( ,, ). |
| 1576-7. June 14, '77, . . | Southampton. | ( ,, ). |
| June 22, '76–June 1, '77, . | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| 1577, . . . . . | Stratford-on-Avon. | ( ,, ). |
| 1577-8. Jan. 19, '78, . . | Nottingham. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 23, '77–Oct 22, '78, . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| [After Feb., '78], . . | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| 1579-80. Nov. 29, '79–Nov. 22, '80, . . . . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| 1580-81, . . . . . | Plymouth. | ( ,, ). |
| 1581, . . . . . | Abingdon. | ( ,, ). |
| 1581-2. June 15, '82, . . | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 15, '81–Nov. 8, '82, . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| | Southampton. | ( ,, ). |
| 1582-3. June 7, '83, . . . | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| | Doncaster. | ( ,, ). |
| 1583-4. Dec. 22, '83, . . | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| March 6, '84, . . . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 26, '83–Nov. 24, '84, . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| March, '84, . . . | York. | ( ,, ). |
| 1584-5. Mar. 20, '84–[Mar.], '85, | Maidstone. | ( ,, ). |
| 1585, . . . . . | Barnstaple. | ( ,, ). |

(Edward Somerset, Earl of Worcester, 1589, Feb. 21–1628, Mar. 3.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1589-90. Nov. 26, '89—Dec. 15(?), '90, . . . | Coventry. | Earl of Worcester's players). |
| 1590-1. Oct. 30–Nov. 22, '90, . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| [Before June 2, '91], . . | Faversham. | ( ,, ). |
| March 31, '91, . . . | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| June 2, '91, . . . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| June 26, '91, . . . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| [After June 6, '91], . . | Marlborough. | ( ,, ). |
| | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| | Shrewsbury. | ( ,, ). |
| 1591-2. Nov. 11, '91, . . | Southampton. | ( ,, ). |
| | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| April 15, '92, . . . | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| [Before June 10, '92], . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| Dec. 9, '91–Nov. 29, '92, . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| 1592-3. Oct. 18, '92, . . | Southampton. | ( ,, ). |
| '92, . . . . . | Plymouth. | ( ,, ). |
| May, '93, . . . . | York. | ( ,, ). |
| [After June 20, '93], . . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |
| 1593-4. March 30, '94, . . | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| | Maidstone. | ( ,, ). |
| Sept. 10, '93–[Oct.], '94, . | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| 1594-5. [After Jan. 1, '95], . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| 1595-6. Dec. 3, '95, . . . | Ludlow. | ( ,, ). |
| Aug. 1, '96, . . . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| Oct. 10, '95–Oct. 14, '96, . | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| 1597-8. Aug., '98, . . . | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |
| 1598-9. [Dec. 12, '98–July 4, '99], | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| April, '99, . . . . | York. | ( ,, ). |
| 1600-1. Nov. 20, '00–Dec. 2, '01, | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| 1601-2. Dec. 2, '01–Dec. 20, '02, . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| 1602-3. [Ap. 3, '02–Aug. 18, '03], | Leicester (twice). | ( ,, ). |
| Dec. 20, '02–Nov. 27, '03, . | Coventry (twice). | ( ,, ). |
| | Barnstaple. | ( ,, ). |

## IV

## 1, 2, EARL OF PEMBROKE'S COMPANIES

### I

A COMPANY of players, under the patronage of an Earl of Pembroke, first appeared in 1575-6, when they acted at Canterbury. At that time Henry Herbert was Earl of Pembroke, which title he held till Jan. 19, 1601. The next appearances of an Earl of Pembroke's company were on Dec. 27, 1592, and Jan. 6, 1593, when they acted at Court.[1] Since 1575-6 the company, if at all the same, must have undergone many changes. Their London season of 1592-3 was cut short by the ravages of the plague in the

[1] Mr. Fleay believes that this Earl of Pembroke's company was the Earl of Worcester's company prior to 1589, and that after the death of the Earl of Worcester on Feb. 22, 1589, his company passed under the patronage of the Earl of Pembroke. This opinion I have shown to be fallacious (cf. above, 48 *n.*). Mr. Fleay also believes that Pembroke's 'was the company abused by Nash' (*i.e.* in his address to Greene's *Menaphon*, published 1589), 'in 1589 as having anticked it up and down the country with Delfrigus [Del Phrygio] and the King of the Fairies' (*Stage*, 87), and, consequently, that 'Pembroke's men are first heard of in London in 1589' (*Stage*, 87; cf. also *Drama*, i. 258). But the description of the company to which Nash referred in 1589 as having been a strolling company which was now rivalling the Queen's men (*Drama*, i. 258), does not at all agree with what is known of Pembroke's men at this time. There are no records of them in the country from 1575-6 to 1592-3, and as for 'rivalling the Queen's men' in London they are not mentioned as playing in London or at Court from 1583, the date of the formation of the Queen's company, till 1592 when they appeared twice at Court, the Queen's men having during these years played some eighteen times at Court.

city. About Feb., 1593, the companies seem to have been ordered to stop acting,[1] and Pembroke's probably soon left the city to travel in the provinces. They visited Ipswich, Leicester, Coventry, York, Shrewsbury, Ludlow, and Bath. As they could not pay their travelling expenses they returned to London about the end of August, when they were forced to pawn some of their properties.[2]

Of the construction of the Earl of Pembroke's company before 1594 little is known, and that 'little' involves us at once in a discussion of the difficult question of the relation of the 3 *Henry VI.* of 1623, to the *True Tragedie* of 1595 and the intervening editions. In 1595 Thomas Millington had printed for him *The true Tragedie of Richard Duke of Yorke, and the death of good King Henry the Sixt, with the whole Contention betweene the two Houses Lancaster and Yorke, as it was sundrie times acted by the Right Honourable the Earle of Pembroke his seruants.* This quarto was reprinted for Millington in 1600. In 1619 Thomas Pavier published in a single volume, *The whole Contention betweene the two Famous Houses, Lancaster and Yorke, with the Tragicall ends of the good Duke Humfrey, Richard Duke of Yorke, and King Henrie the Sixt, divided into two Parts: And newly corrected and enlarged. Written by William Shakespeare, Gent.* This edition contains some alterations of the 1595, 1600 editions, but is still very different from the 1623 3 *Henry VI.*[3] In the first folio of Shakespeare, 1623, appeared the

[1] Cf. below, 86-87.
[2] Collier, *Memoirs of Edward Alleyn*, 32.
[3] Ward, *History*, ii. 59.

final form of this play, entitled, *Henry VI., Part* 3. Internal evidence has shown pretty conclusively that the *True Tragedy* is a preliminary sketch of the 3 *Henry VI.*, and that both plays have been worked in part by Shakespeare.[1] The date of the 3 *Henry VI.* is almost certainly between 1591 and 1595; 1593 being the most probable date.[2]

In the stage directions of 3 *Henry VI.* appear the actors' names, 'Gabriel, Sinklo, and Humfrey';[3] no doubt standing for Gabriel Spenser, John Sinkler, and Humphrey Jeffes, for Henslowe, in the *Diary*, calls Spenser 'Gabriel,'[4] Jeffes is the only known actor of this period bearing the first name of 'Humphrey,' and, besides, he was associated with Gabriel Spenser in the Lord Admiral's company of 1597,[5] and 'Sinklo' is certainly a spelling for 'Sinkler,' which name was borne by John Sinkler alone among the actors of 1550 to 1642. Now, as Shakespeare seems to have been a member of the company known successively as the Lord Strange's, the Earl of Derby's, the Lord Hunsdon's, and the Lord Chamberlain's men up to 1603,[6] the question arises, How comes it that Shakespeare touched up

[1] Ward, *History*, ii. 62-63; Lee, *Life*, 60-62; Miss Jane Lee, *Trans. New Shakspere Soc.*, 1876, pt. ii. Mr. Fleay's theory that 3 *Henry VI.* is practically the original play, and that the *True Tragedy* is a careful and accurate abridgement made 'apparently by the author himself,' that is Marlowe, for acting purposes (*Life of Shakespeare*, 272-273) seems untenable in the light of internal evidence.

[2] Lee, *Life*, 62; Ward, *History*, ii. 58; Dowden, *Shakspere Primer*, 1890, 56.

[3] *The Works of William Shakespeare*, reduced facsimile of 1623 folio, 1887, 150, 158.

[4] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 82.

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] From this point I have called this company the 'Strange-Chamberlain' company for ease of reference.

the *True Tragedy* for the Earl of Pembroke's men, and what was the connection of Gabriel Spenser, Humphrey Jeffes, and John Sinkler with Shakespeare's company and the Earl of Pembroke's men ?

Before discussing this question it is necessary to point out the close connection of the Strange-Chamberlain's, the Lord Admiral's, and the Earl of Pembroke's companies from 1592 to 1597-8. These companies were all, more or less, connected with the Henslowe-Alleyn theatrical ventures. Thus, in 1592, Feb. 19 to June 22, and 1593, Dec. 29 to Feb. 1, the Strange-Chamberlain's men acted at Henslowe's theatre, the Rose.[1] When they were forced to travel during the summer of 1593, Edward Alleyn, a Lord Admiral's man, accompanied them as their chief player.[2] While on the tour Alleyn inquired of Henslowe about Pembroke's men, and Henslowe replied that they were in London in great financial straits.[3] From June 3 to 13, 1594, the Admiral's and Strange-Chamberlain's men were both playing at Newington Butts.[4] In October, 1597, Pembroke's and the Admiral's companies were both playing at the Rose.[5] The relationship of these companies being thus intimate, frequent transfers of players and plays from one company to the other would be very probable.

[1] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 11-16.

[2] Cf. below, 87-88.

[3] Collier, *Memoirs of Edward Alleyn*, 32.

[4] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 17.

[5] *Ibid.*, 54.

[6] Till 1595 there seems to have been little of that stage rivalry which showed itself in the stage quarrel of the succeeding years. Cf. *The Stage Quarrel betueen Ben Jonson and the so-called Poetasters*, Roscoe Addison Small. Breslau, 1899.

Now to return to the question of the relationship of Shakespeare, Spenser, Jeffes, and Sinkler to the Earl of Pembroke's and the Strange-Chamberlain's companies before 1595. As there is no record of Gabriel Spenser or Humphrey Jeffes ever being connected with the Strange-Chamberlain's company, their first recorded appearance being as Admiral's men in 1597,[1] and, as the *True Tragedy*, which was acted by Pembroke's men, and the 3 *Henry VI.* are different editions of the same play, it has been assumed with great plausibility that Spenser and Jeffes were Pembroke's men about 1592-3, when these plays seem to have been produced.[2] But the acceptance of this assumption is fraught with two difficulties, (*a*) How comes it that John Sinkler, almost certainly a Strange-Chamberlain man in 1592,[3] and probably continuously connected with that company till 1604,[4] appears in the stage directions with two Pembroke's men ? and (*b*) How does it happen that Shakespeare, a Strange-Chamberlain's man throughout his career, had a hand in a play acted by Pembroke's men ?[5]

In order to clear up these difficulties it is necessary to trace the history of the Strange-Chamberlain's and the Earl of Pembroke's companies from 1592 to

[1] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 82.

[2] Fleay, *Stage*, 137 ; also 373, 376.

[3] Cf. below, 79 f.

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] The first of these difficulties Mr. Fleay seems to dodge, for he first states that Gabriel Spenser, Humphrey Jeffes, and John Sinkler were all members of Pembroke's company before 1594 (*Life of Shakespeare*, 272), though later he says that Sinkler was connected with the Strange-Chamberlain company alone (*Stage*, 376). He meets the second difficulty by dating the 3 *Henry VI.* before the *True Tragedy* (*Life of Shakespeare*, 272-273). This theory seems untenable in the light of internal evidence (cf. above, 61, *n.*).

1594. About March 6, 1592, John Sinkler and William Shakespeare were probably members of the Strange-Chamberlain's company, of which Edward Alleyn, a Lord Admiral's man, was the leading actor. They acted at the Rose from Feb. 19 to June 22, 1592.[1] Then they made a summer tour, reopening at the Rose on Dec. 29. Here they acted till Feb. 1, 1593.[2] During the winter of 1592-3 Pembroke's men acted in London.[3] In 1592-3 Gabriel Spenser and Humphrey Jeffes were most likely members of Pembroke's company, for their names do not appear in the probable list of the Strange-Chamberlain's men for 1592, or in the partial list of that company for May, 1593.[4] John Sinkler, on the other hand, appears as a Strange-Chamberlain's man in the 1592 list of that company.

Before Sept. 3, 1592, Shakespeare must have retouched the original of the *True Tragedy* for Pembroke's men, who were probably the owners of the original play, for Robert Greene, who died on that day, wrote on his deathbed his *A Groats-worth of Wit bought with a Million of Repentance*, in which he says: 'There is an upstart Crow, beautified with our feathers, that with his "Tyger's heart wrapt in a player's hide," supposes he is as well able to bumbast out a blanke verse as the best of you; and being an absolute "Johannes factotum" is, in his owne conceit, the only Shake-scene in a countrie.' This was a palpable hit at Shakespeare's success in retouching the original of the *True Tragedy*, for the line quoted travesties a line in the *True Tragedy*,

[1] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 13-15.
[2] *Ibid.*, 15-16.
[3] Cf. below, 71.
[4] *Ibid.*, 79; 88.

'Oh, Tiger's heart wrapt in a woman's hide.'[1] Though Shakespeare was at this time almost certainly a Strange-Chamberlain's man, there is nothing inexplicable in his touching up a play for Pembroke's men, when the friendly relations of these two companies, as pointed out above, is considered. It was probably from a copy of this 1592 *True Tragedy* that the quarto of 1595 was printed, for this would account for the quarto being called a Pembroke's play, and for the appearance of Shakespeare's hand in its composition.

In the spring of 1593 the London companies were forced to travel by the ravages of the plague. Both the Strange-Chamberlain's company, under the leadership of Edward Alleyn, and the Earl of Pembroke's men appeared frequently in the provinces during the summer. John Sinkler, though not mentioned in the partial list of the Strange-Chamberlain company for May, 1593, was probably still a member of the company. Gabriel Spenser and Humphrey Jeffes probably toured with Pembroke's men. During August this company returned to London in great financial straits, and were forced to pawn some of their 'properties.'[2] Though the Strange-Chamberlain's company did not reach London till December, it was probably during the autumn or early winter that they obtained the *True Tragedy* from the hard-up Pembroke's company. They could easily do this, even though in the country, by means of Henslowe, or one of their

[1] Lee, *Life*, 59-60 ; Dowden, *Shakspere Primer*, 1890, 77. This line also occurs in 3 *Henry VI.*

[2] Collier, *Memoirs of Edward Alleyn*, 32.

members who remained in London.[1] When the company returned to London in December and began to prepare for their London season of 1593-4, they were probably joined by Gabriel Spenser and Humphrey Jeffes from Pembroke's men. The *True Tragedy* was probably again revised by Shakespeare, and brought into a form much like the 3 *Henry VI.* When this play was acted, Spenser, Jeffes, and Sinkler would play in it, and so their names might creep into the stage directions of the copy which appeared in the 1623 folio. As the play was popular[2] the publishers would be anxious to obtain a copy, and the actors eager to keep it out of the publishers' hands. Millington seems to have obtained by some means the *True Tragedy*, as acted by Pembroke's men, before it passed to the Strange-Chamberlain company, and published it in 1595. This was reprinted in 1600. Not till 1619 did a more or less imperfect copy of Shakespeare's 1593-4 revision of the *True Tragedy* appear.

Apparently, then, Gabriel Spenser and Humphrey Jeffes were members of the Earl of Pembroke's company till *c.* December, 1593, when they joined the Strange-Chamberlain's company. In all probability Antony Jeffes, the brother of Humphrey, was also a member of Pembroke's company before December, 1593, for, though there is no definite mention of him as a member of that company, he never appeared except in the same company as

[1] Shakespeare probably remained in London to work on his *Venus and Adonis*, which appeared in the early summer of 1593, and his *Lucrece*, which was published the next year (cf. below, 88). He may have obtained the *True Tragedy*, in which he had a hand, for his company.

[2] Lee, *Life*, 59.

Humphrey.[1] If this be so, he most likely joined the Strange-Chamberlain's company with his brother and Spenser, *c.* December, 1593. Of the other actors composing Pembroke's company before 1594 nothing is known.

How long Spenser and the Jeffes remained with the Strange-Chamberlain company is doubtful. Edward Alleyn, in all probability, rejoined the Lord Admiral's company about May 14, 1594, when they opened at the Rose,[2] and his fame would help to fill the benches; he had certainly rejoined that company by December, 1594,[3] for his name then appeared at the head of a list of its principal actors.[4] Possibly Spenser and the Jeffes followed Alleyn to the Admiral's company in 1594, though their names do not appear in a list of that company till 1597.[5]

From 1593 till the summer of 1597 nothing is heard of an Earl of Pembroke's company. Probably the company, which was in great financial difficulties in the autumn of 1593, and seems to have lost some of its actors a little later in that year, soon after disbanded, its properties being dispersed and its actors joining other companies.[6]

II

In July, 1597, a company, under the patronage of the Earl of Pembroke, played at Bristol. There

[1] Cf. below, Admiral's and Prince Henry's companies.
[2] Cf. below, 114, 117-118.
[3] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 17.
[4] *Ibid.*, 5.
[5] *Ibid.*, 82.
[6] Fleay considers this company to have been in continuous existence from 1589 to 1601 (*Stage*, 369). But this is only because he knew of no evidence to the contrary.

is nothing to show that this company contained any of the actors of the former Pembroke's company. On Oct. 11, Pembroke's men opened with the Lord Admiral's company at the Rose.[1] The two companies seem to have acted together till November 5, 1597, when Pembroke's men probably left the Rose. The evidence for this separation of the companies on November 5 is fairly conclusive, if allowance is made for Henslowe's inaccurate methods of bookkeeping. It is, (*a*) The account beginning Oct. 11, 1597, which refers to the Earl of Pembroke's and the Lord Admiral's companies acting together at the Rose, ends on Nov. 5, leaving three inches of the page blank.[2] (*b*) A few pages farther on is the following entry :—

'Lent vnto Roberte shawe the 23 of octob$^{r}$ 1597 to by a boocke for the company of my lord admeralls men & my lord penbrockes the some of . . xxx$^{s}$ called the cobler wittnes
E Alleyn'[3]

The next entry is :—

'lent vnto Robart shawe the 5 of novemb$^{r}$ 1597 to by a boocke of yonge horton for the company of my lord admeralles men and my lord of penbrockes the some of . . . . . x$^{s}$
wittnes E Alleyn'

After this follows :—

'lent vnto Robert shawe the 26 of novemb$^{r}$ 1597 to by viij y$^{rd}$ of clothe of gowld the some of fower pownde J saye lent [for] . . .
the vsse of the company . . . . . iiij$^{li}$

[1] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 54. [2] *Ibid.* [3] *Ibid.*, 69.

Then after a few items, which do not bear on the present point, comes the entry :—

> 'R⁊ of the companey of my lorde admeralles men in pte of payment the firste of desemb⁵ 1597 of Robarte shawe the some of . . . . xx$^{s}$.' [1]

These items seem to indicate that between Nov. 5, 1597, and Nov. 26 or Dec. 1, 1597, Pembroke's men ceased acting with the Admiral's. (*c*) A few pages farther on in the *Diary* Henslowe begins an account thus, 'A Juste a cownt of all suche money as J haue layd owt for my lord admeralles [men] players begynyng the xj of octob⁵ whose names ar as foloweth borne gabrell shaw Jonnes dowten Jube towne synger & the ij geffes 1597.' [2] The first three entries under this heading are the same as those quoted above, except that in the first the name of Pembroke's company is omitted, the entry reading 'a boocke for the companey,' and Oct. 23 is changed to Oct. 21 ; in the second all mention of the companies is omitted, obviously implying that, as the entry appears in an account of the Admiral's men, the book was bought for that company. The explanation of this repetition of entries and of the differences between the first and second statement of them may be that some time after the first set of entries was made Henslowe carelessly re-entered them in the second account, or more likely that when the second set of entries was made the Admiral's men had gained sole possession of the properties which are mentioned in the first set of entries as belonging to both companies. Either explanation

[1] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 70.

[2] *Ibid.*, 82.

tends to confirm the theory that Pembroke's men ceased acting with the Admiral's at the Rose on Nov. 5, 1597.

The only evidence which appears, at first sight, to be against this theory is that the *Diary* contains an account beginning October 21, 1597, and running till March 4, 1598, which is headed thus, 'A Juste a cownte of all Suche monye as J haue Receued of my lord [of] admeralles & my lord of penbrocke men as foloweth be gynynge the 21 of octob: 1597.'[1] But this account was probably begun at the time when the set of entries about 'the cobler' and the 'boocke of yonge horton' were entered to both companies, for it occurs on the page just before and opposite those entries. If so, the account was begun and the first four entries were made while both companies were acting at the Rose. Then, when Pembroke's men ceased acting on Nov. 5, Henslowe carelessly failed to note the fact, and continued to enter his weekly share of the receipts at the Rose as though both Pembroke's and the Admiral's men were still acting there. Such carelessness is quite in accord with Henslowe's slovenly bookkeeping. There can be little doubt then, that Pembroke's company stopped acting at the Rose on Nov. 5, 1597.[2]

As nothing is heard of Pembroke's men in the provinces till July, 1598, they probably acted in London during the winter. If so, the letter of February 19, 1598, from the Privy Council to the

[1] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 68.

[2] For Mr. Fleay's theories concerning this company during 1597, cf. ii. 122 f.

Master of the Revels and Justices of Peace of Middlesex and Surrey may refer to Pembroke's company. This letter states that though there were only two companies, the Lord Admiral's and the Lord Chamberlain's, licensed to play in London, a third company had 'of late by way of intrusion' ventured to play in the city. As this company had not 'prepared any plaie for her Majestie,' and were not bound to obey the prescribed orders of the Master of the Revels, the Council ordered its suppression.[1] Pembroke's men had not played at Court since Christmas, 1592-3, so the statements of the letter agree with their known history.

On July 7, 1598, the Earl of Pembroke's company played at Bristol, in October of the same year they were at Dover, and in December at Coventry. They next appeared on April 11, 1599, at Norwich, then at Leicester, Coventry, Bristol, and Bath. During the spring of 1600 they acted at Leicester, Bristol, and Marlborough, and on October 28 and 29 at the Rose.[2] Soon after this the company probably disbanded, as nothing further is heard of them either in London or the provinces.[3]

## COURT PERFORMANCES

| | |
|---|---|
| 1592. Dec. 27, . . . | (Earl of Pembroke's players).[4] |
| 1593. Jan. 6, . . . . | ( „ ). |

[1] Collier, i. 298.

[2] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 131.

[3] For a discussion of Mr. Fleay's theories concerning this company, cf. ii. 122 f.

[4] Chalmers, *Apology*, 400-401. The Earl of Pembroke's men were paid £13, 6s. 8d., and given a reward of £6, 13s. 4d., on March 11, 1593, for plays performed on 'St. John's Day, at night,' and 'Twelfth Day, at night.'

## PROVINCIAL VISITS

(Henry Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, 1570, March 17–1601, Jan. 19; Lord President of Wales, 1586-1601.)

I

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1575-6, . . . . . | Canterbury. | (Earl of Pembroke's players). |
| 1592-3, . . . . . | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |
| [Dec. 19, '92–June 20, '93], . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 29, '92–Nov. 26, '93, . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| June, '93, . . . . | York. | ( ,, ). |
| | Shrewsbury. | ('The Lord President's' [of Wales] players). |
| Oct. 28, '92–Oct. 27, '93, . | Ludlow. | ( ,, ). |
| [Aug. 22]–Sept. 10, '93, . | Bath. | (Earl of Pembroke's players). |

II

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1596-7. July, '97, . . . | Bristol. | (Earl of Pembroke's (players). |
| Oct. 14, '96–Oct. 14, '97, . | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| 1597-8. July, '98, . . . | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |
| 1598-9. Oct. 7–Nov. 1, '98, . | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| Dec. 12, '98, . . . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| April 11, '99, . . . | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| [Before June 22, '99], . . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| July 4, '99, . . . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| July, '99, . . . . | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |
| Oct. 30, '98–Oct. 13, '99, . | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| 1599-1600. Jan. 1–Sept. 29, '00, | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| *c.* April 1, '00, . . . | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |
| *c.* May 24, '00, . . . | Marlborough. | ( ,, ). |

## V

## THE STRANGE-CHAMBERLAIN COMPANY[1]

(*i.e.* 2, Lord Strange—4, Earl of Derby—6, Lord Chamberlain's Company.)

THIS company, which I have called the Strange-Chamberlain company, first appeared in 1576-7, at Exeter. It was the second company which Ferdinando Stanley, who was known as Lord Strange from 1572 to Sept. 25, 1593, had taken under his patronage. From 1576-7 to 1588 this company acted frequently in the provinces. There are no records of them in London or at Court during these years. Until 1588 we know nothing of the construction of the company. About October of that year, however, the company was probably thoroughly reorganised. Several of the principal actors of Lord Leicester's company, including Kemp, Bryan, and Pope, seem to have then joined it, and some of its actors been transferred to the old Leicester company.[2] The evidence for this reorganisation is, that when we first hear certainly of the actors of Lord Strange's company in May, 1593, we find among them Will. Kemp, George Bryan, and Thomas Pope.[3] Now, as we have seen,

[1] This company had many patrons, cf. below, and also the companies of the Earl of Derby, Countess of Derby, and Lord Hunsdon. For other Lord Chamberlain's companies, cf. the Earl of Sussex's, the Lord Admiral's, and Lord Hunsdon's players.

[2] Cf. above, 36.

[3] Cf. below, 87-88.

these men were most likely members of Lord Leicester's company before and after their trip abroad in 1585-1587. In September, 1588, the Earl of Leicester died, and his company was forced to seek a new patron. This was a matter of utmost importance to the company, for a patron of great influence was necessary to assure their standing and privileges both in London and the provinces.[1] In all probability, while the company's affairs were in this uncertain state, Kemp, Bryan, Pope, and possibly others, left the company for Lord Strange's men. This change probably took place about the end of September, 1588, after the Earl of Leicester's men returned to London from the provinces.[2]

[1] J. T. Murray, *English Dramatic Companies in the Towns outside of London*, 1550-1600, *Modern Philology*, ii. 541.

[2] This account of the change which took place in the Earl of Leicester's company and Lord Strange's company in 1588 differs materially from that of Mr. Fleay. He says 'In 1588, September 4, Leicester died, and immediately after Edward Alleyn formed a company under Lord Strange's patronage. As Strange's men included Pope, Kempe, Bryan, and Shakespeare, I have no doubt that they were, excluding Greene, substantially the same company as Leicester's men' (*Stage*, 82).

Now, in the first place, the reconstruction of these companies did not take place 'immediately' after Sept. 4. On Sept. 14, the Earl of Leicester's company was acting at Ipswich under their old name. At that time, being on tour, they probably had not heard of their patron's death. As soon as they did, they no doubt returned to London, and before long their reconstruction took place. I have consequently stated that the reconstruction occurred about the end of September, 1588. Secondly, as I have shown in my account of the Earl of Worcester's men (cf. above, 47-48), Edward Alleyn did not form a 'company under Lord Strange's patronage,' or even join such a company in Sept., 1588. Thirdly, Greene was not a member of Lord Leicester's company, and so could not have been transferred from that company to Lord Strange's in Sept., 1588 (cf. above, 34 *n.*). Finally, it is highly improbable that Leicester's company was transferred wholesale to the patronage of Lord Strange in 1588. Mr. Fleay knows nothing of a Lord Strange's company before 1588 (*Stage*, 82, 369), and so, upon finding several of Leicester's men before 1588 appearing as Strange's men after that date, he not unnaturally concludes that Leicester's company passed under

If, as is not improbable, Shakespeare had joined the Earl of Leicester's company during their visit to Stratford-on-Avon in 1587,[1] he was almost certainly one of the men who went over to Lord Strange's company in Sept., 1588, for with this company, under its various patrons, he was connected from 1594, the date of his first certain appearance as a member of any dramatic company, till his retirement from the stage.[2]

In November, 1589, we hear of the new Lord Strange company in connection with the inhibition of players in the city and liberties of London on account of the anger of the authorities at the introduction of Martin Marprelate on the stage. There is no evidence that Lord Strange's men had represented Martin on the stage, as the Queen's men[3] and Paul's boys[4] seem to have done, or that they had directly offended either City or Court by acting 'matters of state and religion.' Nevertheless, on November 5, they were summoned before the Mayor and ordered to stop playing till further order. Probably relying on their innocence and the influence of their patron Lord Strange, they treated the Mayor's orders with contempt, 'and wente to the Crosse Keys, and played that afternoone.' Such

Lord Strange in 1588. But, as a matter of fact, there had been a company under the patronage of Ferdinando Stanley, Lord Strange, since 1576-7. Such being the case, it seems highly improbable that Lord Strange would in 1588 transfer his patronage from his own company to that of Lord Leicester. It is much more probable that both companies were reconstructed, some of Leicester's men joining Lord Strange's company, and the discards of this company going to the old Leicester company, which then sought a new patron.

[1] Cf. above, 36.

[2] Cf. below, lists of Strange-Chamberlain and King's players.

[3] Cf. above, 13.

[4] Cf. below, 326-327.

defiance was not tolerated, however, and they were again summoned before the Mayor, forbidden to play, and two of their number committed to the Counter.[1]

In order to make it impossible for players to introduce 'matters of state and religion' on the stage in future, the Privy Council, on November 12, wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Mayor, and the Master of the Revels, ordering that all future plays be licensed by a body of three persons, one nominated by the Archbishop, one by the Lord Mayor, and one by the Master of the Revels. They were to strike out all matter which might give offence.[2]

Lord Strange's company was also, no doubt, affected by the order of the Privy Council to the Lord Mayor on July 25, 1591, which directed that all plays on Sundays and Thursdays be suppressed. Plays were prohibited on Thursdays because they interfered with the bear-baitings, 'which are maintained for her Majesty's pleasure,' and were usually held on Thursday.[3]

The Lord Mayor's letter of Nov. 6, 1589, states that Lord Strange's men acted the day before at the Crosse Keys. Whether or not this was the usual playing-place of the company in London at this time we cannot be sure. Apart from this reference there is no definite evidence of where they played till they appeared at the Rose in 1592.[4]

[1] Collier, i. 264-267. [2] Collier, i. 268-269.

[3] Chalmers, *Apology*, 379-380.

[4] On this evidence, *i.e.* the Lord Mayor's letter of Nov. 6, 1589, Fleay conjectures that Lord Strange's men played at the Cross Keys, 1589-91, and Lord Leicester's men 1586-8 (*Stage*, 88). His reason for supposing

Among the papers of Edward Alleyn at Dulwich College, Malone discovered a plot of the second part of Tarleton's *Seven Deadly Sins*.[1] It is necessary to discuss this plot somewhat in detail, because it contains a list of Lord Strange's players. This play was probably in imitation of the Italian *Comedie al improviso*, in which the actors made up the dialogue extempore, the story being outlined for them.[2] The plot in this case consists of an Induction and three distinct stories or plays, each representing the effect of indulgence in one of the Deadly Sins, Envy, Sloth, and Lechery. The first part of the *Seven Deadly Sins*, which is lost, no doubt represented the effects of the remaining four Deadly Sins, Pride, Gluttony, Wrath, and Covetousness by similarly arranged appropriate stories or plays.

It has been conjectured that the two plays entitled *Five Plays in One* and *Three Plays in One*, prepared for Court performance at Christmas, 1584-5,

that Lord Leicester's men played at the Cross Keys is, of course, because he supposed that company to have become Lord Strange's men in 1588 (cf. above, 74 *n.*). But as we have shown that before 1588 there existed a Lord Strange's as well as a Lord Leicester's company, and that the new Lord Strange's company of 1588 was made up from both companies, it is quite impossible to use this evidence to show which company occupied the Cross Keys before 1588. In his *Drama* (ii. 126) Mr. Fleay has changed his mind about Lord Strange's acting at the Cross Keys in 1590. In speaking of some stage references in *An Almond for a Parrot, or Cuthbert's Curryknave's Alms*, attributed to Nash, and conjecturally published in 1590, he says 'In p. 3 (Petheram's reprint) it is dedicated to "Cavalier Monsieur du Kempe, Jestmonger and Vicegerent-General to the Ghost of Dick Tarleton," the "curtain" of whose countenance is mentioned. This, I now think, indicates that Kempe, and therefore L. Strange's men were in 1590 acting at the Curtain, not at the Cross Keys, as I guessed in my *History of the Stage*, 86.'

[1] Malone by Boswell, iii. 348-355 ; Collier, iii. 197-202.

[2] It was only natural that Tarleton, who was famous for extemporal versifying, should contrive such a play.

by the Queen's players, were what we know as the first and second parts of the *Seven Deadly Sins.*[1] This suggestion is almost certainly correct, for Tarleton was probably in 1584-5 a member of the Queen's company,[2] and the titles *Five Plays in One* and *Three Plays in One* fit so accurately the first and second parts of the *Seven Deadly Sins.* When both parts were to be acted, the Induction would, of course, precede the first part of the play, and we should have *Five Plays in One, i.e.* Induction and the stories representing the effects of Pride, Gluttony, Wrath, and Covetousness. This would be followed by the second part, or *Three Plays in One*, representing the effect of the three remaining Deadly Sins, Envy, Sloth, and Lechery. We, accordingly, find that the *Five Plays in One* was acted by the Queen's men on Jan. 6, 1585, and the *Three Plays in One* was to have been acted on Feb. 21, 1585, 'but the Queen came not abroad that night.'[3]

The plot of the second part of the *Seven Deadly Sins*, as found in Dulwich College and arranged tabularly, is as follows :—[4]

[1] Fleay, *Stage*, 30.
[2] Cf. above, 7-8.
[3] Cf. above, 15.
[4] Fleay, *Stage*, 84.

## THE SEVEN DEADLY SINS, PART II.

| | | Induction. | Envy. | Sloth. | Lechery. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | [Will. Shakespeare] | Henry 6 | ... | ... | ... |
| | Rich. Burbadge | ... | Gorboduc | ... | Tereus |
| | [John Hemings] | Lidgate | ... | ... | ... |
| | Mr. Aug. Phillipps | ... | ... | Sardanapalus | ... |
| | Mr. Tho. Pope | ... | ... | Arbactus | ... |
| | Mr. Geo. Bryan | Warwick | Damasus | ... | ... |
| | Harry Condell | ... | Ferrex | ... | Lord |
| | Will. Sly | ... | Porrex | ... | Lord |
| | Rich. Cowley | Lieutenant | Lord | Giraldus / Captain | Lord |
| Boy | Sander [Cooke] | ... | Videna | ... | Progne |
| | [Sam Gilburne] | ... | ... | ... | Mercury |
| Boy | Nich. [Tooley] | ... | Lady | Pompeia | ... |
| Boy | Rob. Gough | ... | ... | Aspatia | ... |
| | John Duke | Pursuivant | Lord attendant | Will. Fool | Lord |
| Boy | Rob. Pallant | Warder | Lord attendant | Nicanor | Philomela |
| | John Sinkler | Keeper | Lord attendant | Captain | Julio |
| Boy | T. Belt | Servant | ... | ... | Panthea |
| | John Holland | Warder | Lord attendant | Captain | ... |
| | Tho. Goodall | ... | Lucius | Phronesius / Messenger | Lord |
| | Kit [Beeston] | ... | Lord attendant | Captain | ... |
| [Boy] | Ned. | ... | ... | Rhodope | ... |
| Boy | Will. | ... | ... | ... | Itys |

Musicians—R. Cowley, J. Sinkler and Vincent.

On looking over the list of actors named in the plot we are at once struck by the fact that it mentions three of the actors of Lord Strange's travelling company of 1593, *i.e.* Augustine Phillipps, Thomas Pope, and George Bryan; also that if we compare it with the Lord Chamberlain's company of 1598, we find it contains the names of the following actors of that company, Richard Burbage, Augustine Phillipps, Henry Condell, Thomas Pope, Will. Sly, John Duke, and Christopher [Beeston]. We at first naturally conclude that the list of actors in the second part of the *Seven Deadly Sins* represents the Lord Chamberlain's company about 1597-8. But a closer consideration of the evidence shows fairly conclusively that the plot should be dated about 1592, and gives a list of Lord Strange's players at that date.

In the first place, the plot of the second part of the *Seven Deadly Sins* must date after 1588, when Tarleton died,[1] or he surely would have had a part in it. Secondly, Edward Alleyn, who owned the plot, was a Lord Admiral's man, and only temporarily connected with Lord Strange's men (later, Lord Chamberlain's men) from 1592 to 1594.[2] Consequently, the plot most likely came into his possession while he was connected with Lord Strange's men from 1592 to 1594. Thirdly, in Henslowe's *Diary*[3] we find that Lord Strange's men acted a play called *Four Plays in One*, on March 6, 1592, at the Rose. This must surely have been a revival of the second part of the *Seven Deadly Sins* as prepared for Court perform-

[1] *Dict. Nat. Biog.*
[2] Cf. below, 117.
[3] *Diary*, ed. Greg, p. 13.

ance on Feb. 21, 1585, by Tarleton and Queen's men, under the title, *Three Plays in One.* For this revival, as the first part was not to be acted, the Induction would be removed to the second part, thus making *Four Plays in One* instead of *Three Plays in One.*[1] Such a revival of the famous and popular *Seven Deadly Sins* of Tarleton would have been very likely in 1592, when Henslowe was using every means to make the performances at the newly re-opened Rose popular.[2] If the *Four Plays in One* was the *Seven Deadly Sins*, Part 2, Henslowe's judgment in reviving the play was good, for his receipts on March 6 were xxxis. vid., a comparatively large amount.[3] It is to be observed also that Gabriel Harvey's references to the *Seven Deadly Sins*, in his *Four Letters* of Sept., 1592,[4] would have much more force if the play, either in whole or part, had been recently revived. Fourthly, that Edward Alleyn's name does not appear in the list of actors in the *Seven Deadly Sins*, Part 2,[5] is not against the identification of this play with the *Four Plays in One* of March 6, 1592, but rather favours it; for, as we have seen, Alleyn had only recently joined the company, and consequently had never before taken a part in the extemporal play of the *Seven Deadly Sins*, Part 2, alias *Four Plays in One.* The other members of Lord Strange's company had probably often acted in the play before, and so were

[1] Fleay, *Stage*, 83.

[2] Cf. below, 85.

[3] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 13.

[4] *Four Letters*, 1592, ed. Grosart, i. 194.

[5] There can be little doubt that 'Ned,' the actor of Rhodope, was not Edward Alleyn, who was at this time about twenty-six years old, and already famous. 'Ned' must have been a boy whose surname has escaped us.

better prepared than Alleyn for their parts. Of course, the oftener a company acted such a play, and the more familiar the actors became with their extemporised parts, the more smoothly and successfully the play would go. Finally, that only three of the actors mentioned in the plot of the *Seven Deadly Sins*, Part 2, *i.e.* Pope, Phillipps, and Bryan, appear in the list of Lord Strange's men for 1593, though at least six of them appear in the Lord Chamberlain's list for 1598,[1] does not discount our conclusion that the *Seven Deadly Sins*, Part 2, is the *Four Plays in One*, acted by Lord Strange's men on March 6, 1592, at the Rose, because the 1593 list of Lord Strange's men is only a partial list of the principal actors in a reduced travelling company, a list which mentions only five of the regular Lord Strange's company, and Edward Alleyn, who is styled a Lord Admiral's man.[2]

This evidence leaves little doubt but that the plot of the *Seven Deadly Sins*, Part 2, is no other than the *Four Plays in One*, acted by Lord Strange's men at the Rose on March 6, 1592, and that the list of actors it contains represents Lord Strange's company in 1592.

This list of actors is obviously incomplete. Two of the principal performers in the Induction, those playing Henry VI. and Lidgate, are not mentioned. Why, it is impossible to say. The most plausible conjectures are that Shakespeare acted Henry VI., and John Hemings, Lidgate.[3] Shakespeare was almost certainly a Lord Strange man at this time,

[1] Cf. below, 101.
[2] *Ibid.*, 87-88.
[3] Fleay, *Stage*, 84.

for he had just achieved a great success as the author of the Talbot scenes of 1 *Henry VI.*, acted by Lord Strange's men at the Rose on March 3, 1592.[1] Besides, he may have already shown that talent for acting 'kingly parts' for which he was afterwards noted;[2] if so, Henry VI. would be his natural part in the play. John Hemings very likely acted Lidgate. We may be sure he was a member of Lord Strange's company in 1592, for in 1593 he is mentioned as one of the company,[3] and we never hear of him in any other company.[4] Moreover, at this time he must have been an actor of some prominence, for in the list of Lord Strange's men for 1593 he preceded Augustine Phillipps and George Bryan, actors of some standing. No other unassigned part in this play would suit him so well as Lidgate. That of Mercury would certainly not suit Hemings, who was not young, and probably not 'swift' at this time.[5]

'Sander' was in all probability Alexander Cook, who is often mentioned in later lists of this company.[6]

[1] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 13; also Lee, *Life of Shakespeare*, 58.

[2] Fleay, *Stage*, 83.

[3] Cf. below, 88.

[4] *I.e.* Lord Strange's, 1593; Lord Chamberlain's, 1594-1603; King James's, 1604-1630, d. 1630, Oct.

[5] In 1616 Ben Jonson speaks of Hemings as 'old Master Heminge' (Gifford, *Ben Jonson*, vii. 277). As Jonson was at that time forty-two, Hemings was probably much older. The following lines in some verses on the burning of the Globe in 1613 also bespeak Hemings' age—

> 'Then with swolne eyes, like druncken Flemminges,
> Distressed stood old stuttering Heminges.'

(Halliwell-Phillipps, *Outlines*, i. 311).

[6] Malone by Boswell, iii. 356. This is Steven's conjecture and it is followed by Fleay (*Stage*, 84). Collier, who dates the *Seven Deadly Sins*, Pt. 2, *c.* 1588, objects to the suggestion that 'Sander' was Alexander Cook, that the player of Videna in the play could not have acted female

'Nick,' who took the part of Pompeia, was probably Nicholas Tooley, frequently mentioned in later lists of the company, and at this time a boy.[1] 'Kit' was most likely Christopher Beeston, who appeared as a member of this company, then Lord Chamberlain's men, in 1598.[2] 'Ned' was probably some boy of whom we have lost further traces, and not Edward Alleyn.[3] There is no evidence to show that 'Ned' was Edmond Shakespeare.[4] That 'Will' was William Tawyer, is a very doubtful suggestion. The conjecture is based on the fact that in 1625 one William Tawyer was buried in St. Saviour's, and called in the church register 'Mr. Heminge's man.' This is slight evidence to show that he was an actor who had been apprenticed to Heming's, and so was possibly a member of Lord Strange's company in 1592.[5] 'Will' cannot have been William Shakespeare, as the part Itys in the story would of necessity be played by a boy, Itys being murdered by his mother, according to the fable, when he was twelve years old. The part of Mercury may have been acted by Sam Gilburne,[6] who in 1605 is mentioned

parts in Ben Jonson's *Sejanus*, 1603, and *Volpone*, 1605. He also, in support of his contention, points out that Cook is referred to as married in 1603 (Collier, ii. 405, 406). Though it is not certain that Cook acted female parts in *Sejanus* and *Volpone*, it is probable, because in the lists of actors in both plays his name comes last, the usual position for the names of the boys. If he did act female parts in these plays he must have done so when a man, for supposing him to be thirteen or fourteen years old when he acted in the *Seven Deadly Sins*, Part 2, in 1592, he would be twenty-four or five in 1603. Even so, however, he may have acted female parts, for William Burne or Birde acted such parts for the Admiral's men after reaching manhood (cf. below, 134).

[1] Cf. below, lists of Strange-Chamberlain and King's men.

[2] Cf. below, 101.

[3] Cf. above, 81 *n.*

[4] Fleay, *Stage*, 85.

[5] *Ibid.*, 84; Collier, iii. 311.

[6] Fleay, *Stage*, 84.

in Augustine Phillipps' will as 'my late apprentice.'[1] If the *Deadman's Fortune* were acted by Lord Strange's men *c.* 1592-3, and 'b[oy] sam' of that play be Sam Gilburne,[2] it helps to establish the conjecture that Sam Gilburne acted the part of Mercury in the *Seven Deadly Sins*, Part 2. Though not named in the plot of the *Seven Deadly Sins*, Part 2, Will Kemp was almost certainly a member of Strange's company in 1592.[3] He may have amused the audience with jigs between the various stories of the play.[4]

On February 19, 1592, Lord Strange's company opened at Henslowe's newly-built or refitted theatre, the Rose.[5] It was probably at this time that Edward Alleyn, a Lord Admiral's man, joined Strange's company, in order by his fame to help make the theatre of his prospective father-in-law a financial

[1] Collier, iii. 410.

[2] Cf. below, *n.* 4.

[3] Cf. above, 74.

[4] Fleay, *Stage*, 84. Another plot, that of *The Deadman's Fortune*, was also found among Alleyn's papers at Dulwich College (Malone by Boswell, iii. 358. This plot is now in the British Museum, numbered Additional MS. 10,449). This plot contains the following actors' names and their parts:—three attendants, Darlowe, Robert Lee, b. Sam; Validor's man, b. Sam; a messenger, Burbage. Mr. Fleay conjectures that this play was acted in 1592 or 1593 by Lord Strange's men while both Alleyn and Burbage were connected with that company. He supposes that 'Darlowe' is a mistake for Marlowe, whose plays were at this time being performed by Lord Strange's men (*Diary*, ed. Greg, 13-15); 'b. Sam,' he thinks means Sam Gilburne (cf. above); and he conjectures that Robert Lee who next appears in Queen Anne's company in 1603 was also a boy in Lord Strange's company (*Stage*, 85). With this theory there are two difficulties—(1) That Burbage should have played such an unimportant part in the play; (2) That, in the rather complete list of plays acted by Lord Strange's men at the Rose from Feb. 19, 1592, to Feb. 1, 1593, there is no mention of this play or any one which can be identified with it (*Diary*, ed. Greg, 13-15). However, in the present state of the evidence it is impossible to decide whether or not Fleay's conjecture is the correct one.

[5] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 13, 7; Ordish, *Early London Theatre*, 152 f.

success.[1] Lord Strange's men continued to act at the Rose till June 22, 1592,[2] when they were forced to travel on account of the plague. Records of their visits to Canterbury, Bath, Gloucester, and Coventry have been preserved.

On their return to London, probably in the autumn or early winter, they had some difficulty in obtaining permission to reopen at the Rose, though they were allowed to act three days a week at Newington Butts.[3] On account of having been long disused for plays, and being so difficult to reach, Newington Butts seems to have been thoroughly unsatisfactory, and the company were threatened with the necessity of again travelling. To avoid this they petitioned the Privy Council to allow them to reopen at the Rose. They asserted that their travelling expenses were so great as to threaten their dissolution, and prevent their being ready to act before the Queen when she so desired. They also pointed out that the closing of the Rose had deprived the Thames watermen of one of their main sources of income. To enforce this assertion the watermen also sent a petition to the Privy Council, stating that unless the Rose were reopened they would be ruined. These petitions had the desired effect, and the Rose was allowed to reopen on December 29, 1592.[4]

Lord Strange's men continued to act at the Rose

[1] Cf. below, 117. Alleyn married Joan Woodward, daughter of Henslowe's wife by her first husband, in Oct. 1592 (Collier, *Memoirs*, 23).

[2] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 15.

[3] For the documents on which the statements in this paragraph are based, and a discussion of the points on which my interpretation of them differs from that of Mr. Fleay, cf. ii. 127 f.

[4] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 15.

till February 1, 1593,[1] when that theatre was closed, no doubt on account of the plague, which was very severe that year.[2] They seem to have waited a few weeks in London to see if the plague would abate, then, as it continued its ravages, they were forced to travel. The first mention of them in the country is on May 2, when Alleyn, who was with them, wrote to his wife from Chelmsford.[3] That the company had been at least a few days in the country is implied in the letter. From it also is learned the fact that since Alleyn's leaving London his wife and her 'felowes' had been 'mad to rid in a cart' by 'my lord maiors officer,' and the news had just reached him at Chelmsford.[4] He threatens vengeance when he comes to London, but he evidently does not expect to be in the city for some time.

On May 6, 1593, the Privy Council granted Lord Strange's men a travelling licence,[5] which was probably delivered to the company by some of their 'felowes' who had waited for it in London. This licence stated that it had been granted in order that the players might keep themselves in practice in their art, so that they could perform acceptably before the Queen when she so desired. It permitted the company to perform in any town which was seven miles from London and free from infection. It then

[1] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 16.

[2] Cf. ii. 185, also 127 f., where see a discussion of Fleay's erroneous statements concerning this year's plague. Cf. also Creighton, *History of Epidemics in Britain*, i. 352 f.

[3] Collier, *Memoirs of Edward Alleyn*, 24.

[4] Fleay (*Stage*, 94) simply asserts that 'The players travelled early in May.' He has apparently considered only the date of the licence of May 6, 1592, as a means of dating the company's departure from London.

[5] Halliwell-Phillipps, *Illustrations*, 33.

named the principal players of the company as follows:—

Edward Alleyn, Servant to the
Lord High Admiral.
William Kemp.
Thomas Pope.
John Heminges.
Augustine Phillipps.
George Bryan.

In all probability Richard Cowley, who brought Alleyn a letter at Bristol, there joined the company.[1]

This list of the company is obviously incomplete. Lord Strange's men when travelling carried a large company, as they emphasised when petitioning the Privy Council in 1592.[2] The usual number of actors in a travelling company of any importance seems to have been about ten or eleven.[3] That Shakespeare, almost certainly a member of Strange's company, accompanied them on this tour seems improbable, for he must have been very busy with his *Venus and Adonis*, which was published *c.* June, 1593,[4] and his *Lucrece*, which was entered in the Stationers' Register on May 9, 1594.[5] He probably remained in London to work on these poems.

Thanks to Alleyn's correspondence with his wife and father-in-law,[6] and the provincial records, we can follow the company's tour with some certainty. They probably acted in towns near London till they

[1] Collier, *Memoirs of Edward Alleyn*, 26.
[2] Cf. ii. 127-128.
[3] J. T. Murray, *English Dramatic Companies in the Towns outside of London*, 1550-1600, *Modern Philology*, ii. No. 4.
[4] Lee, *Life*, 78.
[5] *Ibid.*, 79.
[6] Collier, *Memoirs of Edward Alleyn*, 24-32.

received their travelling licence on May 6, 1593, for on May 2 they were at Chelmsford. From Chelmsford they moved towards Bristol, probably *via* St. Albans, Reading, Marlborough, and Bath.[1] From Bristol, on August 1, Alleyn 'being redy to begin the playe of hary of cornwall,' writes to his wife, that Richard Cowley has brought him her letter from London, and that Thomas Pope's kinsman (possibly a member of the company) is returning to London, and will take his letter to her. He also says that the company intends visiting Shrewsbury, Westchester (*i.e.* Chester), and York, and that they do not expect to return to London till 'allholland tyd' (*i.e.* Nov. 1).[2] In this letter Alleyn does not mention that while at Bath he had been so sick that one of his 'felowes' had to play his part for him. This we learn from Henslowe's letter of August 14.[3] From Bristol the company went to Shrewsbury, probably visiting Gloucester, Worcester, and possibly Hereford on the way.[4] At Shrewsbury they found Alleyn's own company, the Lord Admiral's men. Possibly they played together, for the town's reward of 40s. is given 'to my l. Strange and my l. Admyralls players.'[5] If the company carried out the itinerary mentioned by Alleyn at Bristol, they went from Shrewsbury to Chester and York. From York their road probably led them *via* Doncaster, Nottingham, Leicester,

[1] They would naturally avoid London on account of the plague; besides Alleyn's letter of May 2, from Chelmsford, implies that he did not expect to be in London for some length of time.

[2] Collier, *Memoirs of Edward Alleyn*, 25, 26.

[3] *Ibid.*, 29.

[4] These towns were usually favourable to dramatic entertainers. (Cf. Appendix G, vol. ii.)

[5] Cf. ii. 392.

Coventry, and Northampton to London. We hear of them definitely at Leicester and Coventry. Though Henslowe wrote to Alleyn on September 28 [1] that the plague was abating in London, they did not reach that city till December, for on Dec. 2 they played at Coventry.

On Sept. 25, 1593, while the company was on tour, their patron, Lord Strange, became Earl of Derby,[2] and the company assumed that title. The only instances of their being mentioned under this name are the entries of their visits to Coventry on Dec. 2, 1593, and to Leicester, probably about the same time, and on the title-page of the 1594 quarto of *Titus Andronicus*.[3]

Early in 1594 the authorities took preventive measures against the spread of the plague. On Feb. 3, the Privy Council sent the following letter to the Lord Mayor: 'After o^r very hartie cõmendations to yo^r L. Whereas certein infourmation is given that very great multitudes of all sorts of people do daylie frequent & resort to cõmon playes lately again set vp in & about London. whearby it is vpon good cause feared that the dangerous infection of the plague, by Gods great mercy and goodness well slaked, may again very dangerously encreese and break foorth to the great losse and preiudice of her Ma^ts Subiects in gẽrall & especially to those of that Citie of whose safetie & well doing hir Highnes

[1] Collier, *Memoirs of Edward Alleyn*, 32.

[2] Mr. Sidney Lee gives Sept. 25, 1592, as the date of the death of Henry Stanley, Earl of Derby. All other authorities give Sept. 25, 1593 (cf. Lee, *Life*, 36).

[3] Lee, *Life*, 69. G. P. Baker, '*Titus and Vespacia*' and '*Titus Andronicus*' in Henslowe's *Diary*, Mod. Lang. Ass., ix. 16, 66-76.

hath alwayes had an especiall regard as by the last years experience by lyke occasions & resort to playes it soddainly encreased from a very little number to that greatnes of mortallitie w$^{ch}$ ensued. Wee thearfore thought it very expedient to require yo$^{r}$ L. foorthw$^{th}$ to take strait order that thear bee no more publique playes or enterludes exercised by any Companie whatsoever w$^{th}$in the compas of five miles distance from London till vpon better lyklyhood and assurances of health farther direction may bee given from vs to the contrary. So wee bid yo$^{r}$ L. very hartily farewell. ffrom the Court at Hampton. the 3. of February. 1593.'[1]

On April 16, 1594, Ferdinando Stanley, Earl of Derby, died. For a short time after his death his company of players may have acted under the patronage of his widow, for on May 16, 1594, the Countess of Derby's players received a reward at Winchester. Soon after this the company passed under the patronage of Henry Carey, Lord Hunsdon. As Henry Carey was at this time Lord Chamberlain, the company assumed that title. The evidence for this change of patronage is, first, on March 15, 1595, 'William Kempe, William Shakespeare and Richarde Burbage, servauntes to the Lord Chamberleyne,' were paid for two comedies acted at Court on St. Stephen's Day (*i.e.* Dec. 26), and Innocent's Day (*i.e.* Dec. 28), and second,[2] on Dec. 21, 1596, John Hemynge and George Bryan, 'servants to the late Lord Chamberlain (*i.e.* Henry Carey, Lord Hunsdon, who died July 23, 1596), and now servants to the

[1] *Remembrancia*, Malone Soc. Pub., i. 73.
[2] Halliwell-Phillipps, *Illustrations*, 31.

Lord Hunsdon (*i.e.* George Carey, Lord Hunsdon),' were paid for five plays.[1] In later payments at Court to George Carey's company and in lists of them occur the names of most of the actors of Ferdinando Stanley's (*i.e.* Lord Strange and Earl of Derby) company.[2] What happened to Henry Carey, Lord Hunsdon's old company of players, which had been under his patronage since 1564-5, after this change, is unknown; possibly they disbanded or passed under another patron in 1589-90, the date of their last recorded appearance.[3]

Shortly before coming under the patronage of Lord Hunsdon this company most likely lost the services of Edward Alleyn, who would probably rejoin his own company, the Lord Admiral's, when they opened at the Rose on May 14, 1594.[4]

The first mention of Ferdinando Stanley, Earl of Derby's company, under the patronage of Henry Carey, Lord Chamberlain, is that of June 3, 1594, in Henslowe's *Diary*.[5] On that day this company opened at Newington Butts with the Lord Admiral's men. The two companies continued at Newington Butts till June 13, 1594, when the Admiral's men probably moved to the Rose.[6] How long the Lord Chamberlain's men continued to act at Newington Butts after the Admiral's men left them is uncertain. Probably not long, for their receipts there had been

[1] Halliwell-Phillipps, *Illustrations*, 30.

[2] Cf. below.

[3] Cf. ii. 50.

[4] Cf. below, 117. That 'Richard Hoope, William Ferney, W^m^ Blackwage and Rafe Raye,' who are described as Lord Chamberlain's men in Henslowe's *Diary* (ed. Greg, 5-6), were players is highly improbable. We do not find their names elsewhere in the *Diary* as actors, neither do we find them mentioned in any actor list.

[5] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 17.

[6] Cf. below, 115-116 f.

small,[1] and after the Admiral's company reopened at the Rose, a much more accessible theatre on the Bankside, the receipts at Newington Butts would most likely be still smaller. During the summer they must have travelled, for they appeared in Marlborough, apparently about September, 1594.

After their return to London, we find their patron, Lord Hunsdon, petitioning the Lord Mayor to allow his players to continue playing at the Cross Keys. On October 8, 1594, he writes from Nonsuch, 'where my nowe[s] companie of players have byn accustomed, for the better exercise of their qualitie and for the service of her Majestie if need soe requier, to plaie this winter time within the Citye at the Crosse Kayes in Gratious Street, these are to require and praye your Lordship to permitt and suffer them soe to doe, the which I praie you the rather to doe for that they have undertaken to me that where heretofore they began not their plaies till towardes fower a clock, they will now begin at two and have don betwene fower and five, and will nott use anie drumes or trumpettes att all for the callinge of peopell together, and shall be contributories to the poor of the parishe where they plaie according to their habilities.'[2] Apparently, then, the company had begun playing at the Cross Keys on their return to London in 1594. They, no doubt, had had some dispute with the civic authorities about the time of their plays and the use of drums and trumpets to call the people together, as a result of which they feared expulsion from the Cross Keys. They ac-

[1] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 17.
[2] Halliwell-Phillipps, *Illustrations*, 31-32.

cordingly petitioned their patron to intercede on their behalf, and the above letter was the result.[1] Whether or not they were permitted to continue at the Cross Keys we cannot be sure. The next mention of their acting place in London occurs in Lodge's *Wit's Misery* (May 5, 1596), where we learn that *Hamlet* (*i.e.* the old *Hamlet*) had been acted at the Theatre, probably a short time before the publication of *Wit's Misery*.[2] As *Hamlet* was a Lord Chamberlain's men's play, they must have been acting at the Theatre[3] at the time of this reference.

On July 23, 1596, the Lord Chamberlain, Henry Carey, Lord Hunsdon, died, and his son, George Carey, became Lord Hunsdon. He granted his patronage to his father's company of players, who accordingly were known as Lord Hunsdon's men. After July 23, 1596, the company must have gone on tour, for we hear of them at Faversham in that year as Lord Hunsdon's players. They were back in London before Christmas, for during the Christmas holidays they acted six plays at Court. On March 6, 1597, William Brooke, Lord Cobham, who had succeeded Henry Carey, Lord Hunsdon, as Lord Chamberlain, died. On March 17, 1597, George Carey, Lord Hunsdon, was appointed Lord Chamber-

[1] Mr. Fleay supposes that Lord Hunsdon in this letter refers to the company's acting at the Cross Keys in 1592 (*Stage*, 134). There is really no evidence that the company acted at the Cross Keys in 1592, except that they acted there in 1589 (cf. above, 76), and we hear nothing more of where they acted till after 1592. Besides, even supposing we were sure that they acted at the Cross Keys in 1592, it is doing great violence to Lord Hunsdon's letter of 1594 to suppose he refers back to the time when the company was under another patron. Such a reference to past times would not be calculated to impress the Lord Mayor.

[2] Thomas Lodge, *Wit's Misery*, 1596 quarto, 56.

[3] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 17.

lain,[1] and his company again became the Lord Chamberlain's men.

Since *c.* 1596 this company had probably been acting at the Theatre.[2] As James Burbage's lease of that theatre expired on April 13, 1597,[3] he was contemplating building a new theatre in Blackfriars, probably for the Lord Chamberlain's men. This theatre was most likely nearly finished at the time of James Burbage's death in February, 1597.[4] But when completed, the Blackfriars theatre was not occupied by the Lord Chamberlain's men, but by the children of the Chapel.[5] Meanwhile the 'Theatre' remained open, and was probably occupied by the Lord Chamberlain's men.[6] On July 28, 1597, all the theatres were closed by order of the Privy Council,[7] and the Lord Chamberlain's company travelled in the provinces. They appeared at Rye, Dover, Marlborough, Bristol, and Bath.

The inhibition of July 28, 1597, must have been removed by October 11, 1597, when the Lord Admiral's and Earl of Pembroke's men began acting at the Rose.[8] As the Lord Chamberlain's men were acting in Bristol *c.* September 29, the

[1] E. K. Chambers, Malone Soc. Pub., vol. i.

[2] Cf. above, 94.

[3] Halliwell-Phillipps, *Outlines*, i. 346.

[4] Collier, iii. 281-282.

[5] Cf. below, 332-333.

[6] Collier, i. 297.

[7] Collier, i. 297. Mr. Fleay supposes that 'the representation of my Lord Chamberlain Brooke L. Cobham's son Henry as Sir John Oldcastle in Shakespeare's *Henry* 4,' by the Lord Chamberlain's company, was the main cause of this drastic prohibition (*Stage*, 158). This was highly improbable. More likely the acting of Nash's *Isle of Dogs*, possibly by the Lord Admiral's company, was the main cause (*Diary*, ed. Greg, 203).

[8] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 54, 82.

restraint was probably removed about October 1. The Lord Chamberlain's men most likely opened at the Curtain, for,—First, when Marston brought out his *Scourge of Villainy* (S.R. 8 Sept., 1598), he referred to the acting of *Romeò and Juliet*, a Chamberlain's men's play, at the Curtain.[1] Second, Thomas Pope, who was probably connected with this company from its formation in 1588 till his death in 1603-4,[2] was a shareholder in the Curtain as well as the Globe.[3] This fact tends to connect the Chamberlain's men with the Curtain. Such a connection would, of course, be before 1599, when they moved into the Globe.[4] Third, the 'Theatre' is referred to in *Skialetheia* (S.R. 15 Sept., 1598) as 'the unfrequented Theatre,' showing that in 1598 it was unoccupied. The exact date of the Lord Chamberlain's men's beginning to act at the Curtain is uncertain; no doubt it was about the same time as

[1] *Centurie of Prayse*, 27. The passage runs as follows :—

'Lucius, what's plaid to-day? faith, now I know
I set thy lips abroach, from whence doth flow
Naught but pure Juliet and Romeo.
Say, who acts best? Drusus or Roscio?
Now I have him, that nere of ought did speake,
But when of playes or Plaiers he did treate.
H'ath made a common-place booke out of plaies,
And speakes in print, at least, what ere he sayes
Is warranted by Curtaine plaudeties,
If ere you heard him courting Lesbia's eyes;
Say (Curteous Sir), speakes he not mouingly
From out some newe pathetique Tragedie?
He writes, he railes, he jests, he courts, what not,
And all from out his huge, long-scraped stock
Of well-penn'd playes.'

The *Romeo and Juliet* of this passage is probably the second quarto, 1599 version (cf. Fleay, *Drama*, ii. 180-181; *Stage*, 148).

[2] Cf. the various lists of the company.

[3] Chalmers, *Supplemental Apology*, 162.

[4] Cf. below, 97.

the Admiral's and Pembroke's companies began at the Rose, *i.e.* Oct. 11, 1597.[1]

The occupancy of the Curtain by the Lord Chamberlain's men was probably a makeshift while they were negotiating for a renewed lease of the Theatre. Finding that they could not obtain 'a legal ratification of the additional ten years covenanted to be granted to the lessee,'[2] and not wishing to 'remain as tenants,'[3] the Burbages in 1598 determined on the removal of the Theatre to the Bankside, and the erection there of a new theatre out of the old material.[4] Accordingly, in December, 1598, the process of removal was begun, and apparently was completed by January 20, 1599.[5] After this date the work on the new theatre was no doubt pushed rapidly forward, as the Chamberlain's company would be anxious to get into their new quarters. Just when the new theatre, the Globe, was completed we cannot be sure; most likely toward the end of July, for when Peter Street, the builder of the Globe, undertook, on January 8, 1600, to erect the Fortune for Edw. Alleyn and Philip Henslowe, he expected to finish it by July 27, and as this new theatre was to be in many respects like the Globe,

[1] Mr. Fleay seems to be doubtful about the date of the Chamberlain's men opening at the Curtain in 1597. On page 134 (*Stage*) he says positively that they opened at the Curtain on Nov. 1. This statement he repeats on page 148. Yet on page 145 he dates the occupancy of the Curtain by the Lord Chamberlain's men as Oct., 1597-9. His evidence for the date Nov. 1 is, of course, the statement in the restraint of July 28, 1597, that the theatres were to be closed till All Hallows, *i.e.* Nov. 1, 1597 (cf. below, 124). That the theatres were allowed to open as early as Oct. 11, 1597, however, we have definite evidence in the *Diary* (54).

[2] Halliwell-Phillipps, *Outlines*, i. 359.

[3] *Ibid.*, 359.

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] *Ibid.*, i. 360-361.

and was the outcome of his experience in building the Globe, we may be sure that his calculations of time were then based on how long it took him to complete the Globe.[1]

If the Lord Chamberlain's men began to act at the Globe toward the end of July, 1599, it lends some ground to the pleasant thought that Shakespeare's *Henry V.*, revised, and with the choruses as we have them in the folio, was the play chosen for the opening of the new theatre. England, especially London, was deeply stirred over the Earl of Essex's expedition against the rebellion in Ireland, and Shakespeare himself was particularly interested because his friend the Earl of Southampton was General of Horse under Essex.[2] A play full of the alarums of war was what London wanted and would flock to. Essex landed in Ireland on April 15, 1599. Until July all went well with the expedition, and it seemed that the rebellion would soon be at an end. Essex's popularity was very great. But about the end of July matters changed. Quarrels divided the councils of the army, and the disfavour of Elizabeth towards Essex in the early part of August could have been no secret in London. Consequently, the following lines in the Chorus to Act v. could only have been penned and acted before the middle of August :—

> 'But now behold,
> In the quick forge and working-house of thought,
> How London doth pour out her citizens.
> The mayor, and all his brethren, in best sort,

[1] Halliwell-Phillipps, *Outlines*, i. 304 f.
[2] *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, xiv. 433.

Like to the senators of the antique Rome,
With the plebeians swarming at their heels,
Go forth, and fetch their conquering Cæsar in:
As, by a lower but loving likelihood,
Were now the general of our gracious empress
(As, in good time, he may) from Ireland coming,
Bringing rebellion broached on his sword,
How many would the peaceful city quit,
To welcome him! much more (and much more cause)
Did they this Harry.'

Moreover, if this play were the first one at the Globe, how appropriate would be those lines of the opening Chorus, where Shakespeare, restive because of the inadequacy of the newest and best mimic world in London to represent the great world without, describes so minutely the poverty of stage makeshift, and appeals so strongly to the imaginations of his hearers :—

'But pardon, gentles all,
The flat unraised spirits that have dar'd,
On this unworthy scaffold, to bring forth
So great an object: Can this cockpit hold
The vasty fields of France? or may we cram
Within this wooden O the very casques,
That did affright the air at Agincourt?
O, pardon! since a crooked figure may
Attest in little place a million;
And let us, ciphers to this great accompt,
On your imaginary forces work, etc.'[1]

[1] In connection with this quotation it is to be noted that the Globe was a circular theatre, so that though we know not the shape of the Curtain, the description certainly is appropriate to the Globe (Halliwell-Phillipps, *Outlines*, Illustration, i. 182). Mr. Ordish, who follows Halliwell-Phillipps (*Outlines*, i. 177) in asserting that the folio *Henry V.* was acted at the Curtain and not the Globe, has attempted to give reasons for his belief (*Early London Theatres*, p. 85). These are, First, the 'Curtain' was near Finsbury Fields, where the muster of the trained bands took place, and therefore the theatre was located in a martially spirited neighbourhood,

Some time after the acting of Shakespeare's *Henry V.*, Ben Jonson's *Every Man out of his Humor* was produced by the Chamberlain's men at the Globe.[1] In the Induction to this play there is an apparent allusion to *Henry V.*, as follows: 'We see so many seas, countries, and kingdoms, passed over with such admirable dexterity.' Now, by August 10, Jonson was writing a new play for the Admiral's company.[2] Accordingly, then, if the allusion just quoted be to *Henry V.*, and that play was acted at the Globe toward the end of July, 1599, the first performance of *Every Man out of his Humor* at the Globe was probably between the latter part of July and August 10.[3]

where such a play as *Henry V.* would be very popular. The company perceiving this, and not wishing to lose their hold on the Curtain neighbourhood, accordingly left the Globe and acted *Henry V.* at the Curtain. Second, *Henry V.* was a warlike play, and the 'Curtain' was noted for fencing matches, therefore it is likely that the Lord Chamberlain's men acted *Henry V.* there. The second of these reasons is too futile to need refutation. The first seems almost as bad: it implies that the Lord Chamberlain's men would leave their new, well-located and well-equipped theatre, the Globe (for Mr. Ordish considers that the Globe was open and the Lord Chamberlain's men usually acting there), for the old Curtain. This seems incredible, unless for some better reason than the location of the Curtain amidst the muster fields of Finsbury, for surely the martial ardour of the Finsburyites would carry them to the Bankside to hear the alarum of mimic war. Besides, some other company probably occupied the Curtain when the Lord Chamberlain's men left it. They might object to the Chamberlain's men thus 'retaining their hold on the neighbourhood which they had left.'

[1] Title-page, quarto 1600, and below, note (3).

[2] Cf. ii. 145.

[3] Mr. Fleay, who considers the Globe to have been opened in the spring of 1599 (*Stage*, 134), in commenting on *Every Man out of his Humor*, says, 'The mention of "spring," and the allusion to the company's "patent" for the Globe in the Epilogue fix the date of the first performance, I think, to 1599, *c.* April' (*Drama*, i. 361). The lines he refers to are :—

'We entreat
The happier spirits in this fair-filled Globe

From the folio editions of Ben Jonson's *Every Man in his Humor*, and *Every Man out of his Humor*, we obtain lists of the Lord Chamberlain's company before and after their removal to the Globe. The former play, we are told, was acted by the Lord Chamberlain's company in 1598.[1] This performance was probably at the Curtain, as the Globe was not then built.[2] It was written during Jonson's connection with the Lord Chamberlain's company in 1598-9.[3] The list of the company is as follows:—

'[1] Will. Shakespeare [2] Ric. Burbage
[3] Aug. Philips [4] Joh. Hemings
[5] Hen. Condel [6] Tho. Pope
[7] Will. Slye [8] Chr. Beeston
[9] Will. Kempe [10] Joh. Duke.'

The names are arranged as in the folio, the numbers representing their conjectural order. This play was probably performed *c.* November, 1598, after Jonson's release from prison, where he had been lying in danger of his life for the murder of Gabriel Spenser.[4] Before his imprisonment Jonson does

> (So many as have sweet minds in their breasts,
> And are too wise to think themselves are taxed
> In any general figure, or too virtuous
> To need that wisdom's imputation:)
> That with their bounteous hands, they would confirm
> This, as their pleasure's patent: which not so signed,
> Our lean and spent endeavours shall renew
> Their beauties with the spring to smile on you.'
> (Mermaid edition, 255.)

The reference to the Globe is clear enough, but that the reference to the 'patent,' or the revivifying effect of spring, has any more than a general figurative significance seems doubtful.

[1] On Sept. 20, 1598, Tobie Matthew, writing to Dudley Carleton, says that an 'Almain' lost 300 crowns at a new play called *Every Man's Humor*, *Cal. State Papers*, v. 97.

[2] Cf. above, 97.

[3] Cf. ii. 144-145.

[4] Cf. ii. 143 f.

not seem to have ever been connected with the Lord Chamberlain's men.[1] Jonson very likely acted some minor part in the play, for he seems at this time to have been actor as well as playwright. All tradition points to his having been a poor actor,[2] so it is not surprising that his name does not appear in this 1598 list of the principal actors of the Lord Chamberlain's company.

A comparison of this 1598 list of the Lord Chamberlain's company with the 1592 list, made out from Tarleton's *Seven Deadly Sins*, Pt. 2,[3] shows that the company had undergone few changes. Between 1592 and 1598 George Bryan seems to have left the company, otherwise his name would surely have appeared in the 1598 list, for he was too important an actor not to have had one of the principal parts.[4]

[1] Cf. ii., 143 f.

[2] Aubrey says that Jonson 'acted and wrote, but both ill, at the Green Curtaine, a kind of nursery or obscure play-house somewhere in the suburbes, I thinke towardes Shoreditch or Clarkenwell' (Halliwell-Phillipps, *Illustrations*, 29). This statement must refer to Jonson's career between Oct., 1598, and *c.* July, 1599, the only time in his career when he was connected with the Curtain and the Lord Chamberlain's company at the same time.

[3] Cf. above, 79.

[4] Mr. Fleay asserts that Bryan left the Lord Chamberlain's company in 1596 (*Stage*, 371). The only evidence he seems to have is that on July 22, 1596, the company was transferred from the patronage of Henry Carey, Lord Hunsdon, who died on that date, to that of his son, George Carey, Lord Hunsdon. Some changes may have taken place in the company at that time, but there is no definite evidence that Bryan then left them. Chalmers (*Supplemental Apology*, 160) supposed that Bryan remained with the company till his death, which he conjecturally dated in 1598. Collier, however, found in the register of baptisms at St. Andrew's, Blackfriars, the following entry: 'George, sonne to George Bryan. 17 Feb. 1599' (Collier, iii. 364). If this refers to George Bryan the actor, it overthrows Chalmers's conjecture. Just when Bryan left the company cannot be decided, but he surely was not a member of the Strange-Chamberlain's company *c.* Nov. 1598, when that company seems to have performed *Every Man in his Humor*.

Richard Cowley, Sander Cooke, Nicholas Tooley, Robert Gough, and John Sinkler, though not mentioned in the 1598 list, were undoubtedly still Lord Chamberlain's men, for their names appear in later lists of the company.[1] Robert Pallant was probably still a member of the company, as he does not seem to have left it till 1602, when he followed Kemp, C. Beeston, and Duke to the new Lord Worcester's company.[2] T. Goodall seems to have remained with this company till 1596, when his name appeared in the play *Sir Thomas Moore*.[3] No doubt several minor changes had occurred in the company between 1592 and 1598.

The list of the Lord Chamberlain's men, after their removal to the Globe, as given in the folio edition of *Every Man out of his Humor*, is very incomplete, as it contains only six names. These are :—

Ric. Burbage.
John Hemings.
Aug. Phillipps.
Hen. Condell.
Will. Sly.
Tho. Pope.

That Shakespeare, Pallant, Kemp, Duke, Beeston, Cowley, Cooke, Tooley, Gough, and Sinkler were

[1] Cf. below, lists.

[2] Cf. above, 52-53.

[3] *Sir Thomas More*, O.S.S. Pub., 53 ; Fleay, *Drama*, ii. 312. Mr. Fleay in his *Life of Shakespeare* (266) considers Harry, Robin, Kit, the two boys Ned and Robin, Giles and Rafe, to be actors' names. 'Kit' he conjectures to be Christopher Beeston, boy 'Robin' to be Robert Gough, and 'Rafe' to be Rafe Raye. Rafe Raye he has definitely abandoned as an actor in his *Stage* (135). That the other names are those of actors in the play is very doubtful. (Cf. *Sir Thomas More*, O.S.S. Pub., 17, 90.)

still members of the company there can be little doubt.[1]

In February, 1601, the Lord Chamberlain's men injudiciously acted 'the deposing and killing of Richard II.,' at the instigation of some friends of the Earl of Essex, who was then on trial for treason.[2] This almost surely brought them into disfavour at Court, so we are not surprised that they did not appear at Court during Christmas, 1601-2.[3] By the next Christmas, however, they were again in favour, for they acted at Court on Dec. 26, 1602, and Feb. 2, 1603.

[1] Mr. Fleay supposes that Kemp, Beeston, and Duke left the company when they moved into the Globe (*Stage*, 135). This is improbable (cf. ii. 125 f.). Shakespeare, Cowley, Cooke, Tooley, Gough, and Sinkler appear in later lists of the company. [2] *Cal. State Papers*, v., 1598-1601, 573 f.

[3] Mr. Fleay supposes they were inhibited in London for acting *Richard II.* in 1601 (*Stage*, 136), but there is no evidence to show this. Following up this supposition, he states positively that this company was forced to travel after Feb., 1601, and are the players at the Scotch Court during that year (*Stage*, 136). His reason for the latter assertion is that in 1601 a company of English players headed by Laurence Fletcher, who in 1603 appeared as the leading man in the King's company, the new title of the Lord Chamberlain's men, was in Scotland. But in 1599 a company of English players headed by Fletcher and Martin was in Scotland (Dibdin, *Annals of the Edinburgh Stage*, 21 f.). As Martin never appeared as a member of the Chamberlain's men, Mr. Fleay cannot connect this 1599 company with the Chamberlain's, so he guesses it to have been Pembroke's (*Stage*, 136), though there is no evidence that Martin or Fletcher were ever Pembroke's men. As, then, Fletcher was not even a Chamberlain's man in 1599, it seems strange that he should by 1601 be at the head of that company. It seems much more likely that the company he took back to Scotland in 1601 was the same as the one he headed in 1599, Martin meanwhile having left it. It was, no doubt, this company which acted as 'his Majesty's players' at Ipswich on May 30, 1602 (cf. ii. 294). With these men Fletcher probably remained till 1603, when James I., with whom Fletcher had become a favourite while acting in Scotland (cf. James's recommendations of him, etc., Dibdin, *Annals*, 21 f.), succeeded to the English throne. Then, what more likely than that James, when he took the leading English company, the Lord Chamberlain's men, into his patronage, should suggest his favourite Fletcher as their head.

On March 24, 1603, Queen Elizabeth died, and James I. succeeded to the English throne. Soon after his accession he took the Strange-Chamberlain's company under his patronage. Its history, after March 1603, will be found under King James's players.[1]

[1] Cf. King James's players, below, 145 f.

## COURT PERFORMANCES

(Patron, Ferdinando Stanley, Lord Strange, 1572, Oct. 24–1593, Sept. 25.)

| | |
|---|---|
| 1591. Dec. 27, . . . | (Lord Strange's players).[1] |
| Dec. 28, . . . . | ( „ ).[1] |
| 1592. Jan. 1, . . . . | ( „ ).[1] |
| Jan. 9, . . . . | ( „ ).[1] |
| Feb. 6, . . . . | ( „ ).[1] |
| Feb. 8, . . . . | ( „ ).[1] |
| Dec. 26, . . . . | ( „ ).[2] |
| Dec. 31, . . . . | ( „ ).[2] |
| 1593. Jan. 1, . . . . | ( „ ).[2] |

(Patron, Henry Carey, Lord Hunsdon, Lord Chamberlain, 1585, *c.* July 4–1596, July 22.)

| | |
|---|---|
| 1594. Dec. 26, . . . | (Kemp, Shakespeare, and Burbage mentioned).[3] |
| Dec. 28, . . . . | (Kemp, Shakespeare, and Burbage mentioned).[3] |
| 1595. Dec. 26, . . . | (Lord Chamberlain's players).[4] |
| Dec. 27, . . . . | ( „ ).[4] |
| Dec. 28, . . . . | ( „ ).[4] |
| 1596. Jan. 6, . . . . | ( „ ).[4] |
| Feb. 22, . . . . | ( „ ).[4] |
| 1596-7. Christmas, . . . | 'Six interludes.' ( „ ).[5] |

(Patron, George Carey, Lord Hunsdon, Lord Chamberlain, 1597, March 17–1603, April 6.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1597-8, . . . . . | 'Four interludes.' | (Lord Chamberlain's players).[6] |
| 1598. Dec. 26, . . . . | | ( ,, ).[7] |
| 1599. Jan. 1, . . . . | | ( ,, ).[7] |
| Feb. 20, . . . . | | ( ,, ).[7] |
| Dec. 26, . . . . | | ( ,, ).[8] |
| 1600. Jan. 6, . . . . | | ( ,, ).[8] |
| Feb. 3, . . . . | | ( ,, ).[8] |
| Dec. 26, . . . . | | ( ,, ).[9] |
| 1601. Jan. 6, . . . . | | ( ,, ).[9] |
| Feb. 24, . . . . | | ( ,, ).[9] |
| 1602. Dec. 26, . . . . | | ( ,, ).[10] |
| 1603. Feb. 2, . . . . | | ( ,, ).[10] |

## NOTES TO COURT PERFORMANCES

[1] Chalmers, *Apology*, 400. Lord Strange's men were paid £40, and given £20 reward on Feb. 20, 1592, for performing six plays at Whitehall, on St. John's Day, Innocent's Day, New Year's Day, Sunday after Twelfth Day, Shrove Sunday, and Shrove Tuesday.

[2] Chalmers, *Apology*, 400. Lord Strange's men were paid £20, and given £10 reward on March 7, 1593, for three plays at Hampton Court, on St. John's Night, New Year's Eve, and New Year's Day. Mr. Fleay's table of Court Performances (*Stage*, 80) has transferred L. Strange's performance of 1592, Dec. 31, to Pembroke's men, and Pembroke's performance of 1593, Jan. 6, to L. Strange's men. These performances are correctly given in *Stage*, 78.

[3] Halliwell-Phillipps, *Outlines*, i. 121. Wil. Kempe, Wil. Shakespeare, and Rich. Burbadge were paid £13, 6s. 8d., and £6, 13s. 4d. reward, on March 15, 1595, for two comedies at Greenwich, on St. Stephen's Day and Innocent's Day. Fleay (*Stage*, 121) conjectures that one of these plays was Shakespeare's *Comedy of Errors*. The only evidence for this is that on Dec. 28, the *Comedy of Errors* was performed, almost surely by the Lord Chamberlain's men, at Grey's Inn (Halliwell-Phillipps, *Outlines*, i. 122-124). As the Chamberlain's company played the *Comedy of Errors* at Grey's Inn on Dec. 28, a certain probability that they performed the same play at Greenwich about the same time is established. The other play performed in Dec., 1594, by the Chamberlain's men, Fleay conjectures to be *Richard III.* (*Stage*, 121). There is no evidence to prove this.

[4] Halliwell-Phillipps, *Illustrations*, 30. John Hemings and George Bryan, 'servants to the late Lord Chamberlain (*i.e.* Henry Carey, Lord

Hunsdon), and now servants to the Lord Hunsdon (*i.e.* George Carey), were paid on Dec. 21, 1596, for five plays, on St. Stephen's Day, the Sunday following, Twelfth Night, St. John's Day, and Shrove Sunday.'

[5] Chalmers, *Apology*, 401. John Hemings and Thomas Pope were paid £40, and given £20 reward, on Nov. 27, 1597, for six 'interludes' in the Christmas holidays.

[6] Chalmers, *Apology*, 401. John Hemings and Thomas Pope were paid £26, 13s. 4d. and given £13, 6s. 8d. reward, on Dec. 3, 1598, for four 'interludes.'

[7] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxii. John Heming and Thomas Pope were paid £20, and given £10 reward, on Oct. 2, 1599, for three 'interludes or playes,' on 'St. Stevens daye at night, Newyears daye at night, and Shroutewsday at night.'

[8] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxii. John Heming was paid £30 (£20 and £10 reward, in Chalmers, *Apology*, 401), on Feb. 17, 1599 (Feb. 18, in Chalmers, *Apology*, 401), for three 'interludes or playes' on 'St. Stephens daye at night, Twelfdaye at night and Shrouesonday at night.'

[9] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxiii. 'John Hemynges and Richard Cowley' were paid £30, on March 31, 1601 (March 11, 1601; Chalmers, *Apology*, 402), for three plays on 'St. Stephens day at night, Twelfth day at night and Shrovetuesday at night.'

[10] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxiv. 'John Hemynges and the rest of his Companies servaunts to the lorde Chamberleyne' were paid £20 'by way of her Ma[ts] rewarde,' on April 20, 1603, for two plays on 'St. Stephens day at nighte,' and 'Candlemas day at night.' The latter performance was at Richmond (*Outlines*, i. 210).

## PROVINCIAL VISITS

(Ferdinando Stanley, Lord Strange, 1572, Oct. 24–1593, Sept. 25.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1576-7, . . . . . | Exeter. | (Lord Strange's players.) |
| 1578-9. Dec. 7, '78, . . . | Nottingham. | ( ,, ). |
| Oct. 22, '78–Nov. 29, '79, . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |
| July 11, '78–June 9, '79, . | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| 1580-1. October, '80, . . | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |
| March, '81, . . . | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |
| June 9, '80–June 10, '81, . | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| | Plymouth. | ( ,, ). |
| Summer, '81, . . . | Canterbury. | ( ,, ). |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1582-3. June 10, '82–June 15, '83, | Bath. | (Lord Strange's players). |
| | Barnstaple. | ( ,, ). |
| 1583-4, . . . . . | Barnstaple. | ( ,, ). |
| 1586. [After Aug. 22], . . | Faversham. | ( ,, ). |
| 1587-8. Nov. 14, '87–Dec. 4, '88, | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| [1587-9], . . . . | Cambridge. | ( ,, ). |
| 1591, . . . . . | Cambridge. | ( ,, ). |
| 1591-2. July 13, '92, . . | Canterbury. | ( ,, ). |
| June, '91–June 10, '92, . | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| 1591-2, . . . . . | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| Dec. 9, '91–Nov. 29, '92, . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| 1592-3. May 2, '93, . . | Chelmsford. (Cf. account of Lord Strange's men, p. 89.) | |
| Aug. 1, '93, . . . | Bristol. (Cf. account of Lord Strange's men, p. 89.) | |
| | Bath. | (Lord Strange's players). |
| | Shrewsbury. | ( ,, ). |
| | [Chester]. (Cf. account of Lord Strange's men, p. 89.) | |
| | [York]. (Cf. account of Lord Strange's men, p. 89.) | |

(Ferdinando Stanley, Earl of Derby, 1593. Sept. 25–1594, Apr. 16.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1593-4. Dec. 2, '93, . . . | Coventry. | (Earl of Derby's players). |
| | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |

(Alice, Countess of Derby, Ferdinando Stanley's widow.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1593-4. May 16, '94, . . | Winchester. | (Countess of Derby's players). |

(Henry Carey, Lord Hunsdon, Lord Chamberlain, 1585, *c.* July 4–1596, July 22).

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1593-4. [*c.* Sept., '94], . . | Marlborough. | (Lord Chamberlain's players). |

(George Carey, Lord Hunsdon, 1596, July 22–1597, April 17.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1596. After July 23, . . | Faversham. | (Lord Hunsdon's players). |

(George Carey, Lord Hunsdon, Lord Chamberlain, 1597, March 17–1603, April 6.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1596-7. August, '97, . . | Rye. | (Lord Chamber-lain's players). |
| Sept. 3–Sept. 20, '97, . . | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| | Marlborough. | ( ,, ). |
| *c.* Sept. 29, '97, . . . | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |
| Oct. 14, '96–Oct. 14, '97, . | Bath. | ( ,, ). |

## VI

## LORD CHARLES HOWARD, LORD ADMIRAL'S COMPANY[1]

A DRAMATIC company under the patronage of Lord Charles Howard first appeared in December, 1574, when they played the *History of Phœdrastus and Phigon* and *Lucia* together at Court.[2] As Lord Charles Howard was acting Lord Chamberlain from *c.* April 24, 1574, to *c.* Feb. 2, 1577, during the illness of the Earl of Sussex,[3] his company frequently acted under the name of 'the Lord Chamberlain's men' during those years. From 1574 to 1577 this company often acted at Court and in the provinces. It was probably one of the companies

[1] This company was also known as the 3 and 4 Lord Chamberlain's company, and the Earl of Nottingham's company (cf. below, 260 f.). It was the 3 Admiral's company (cf. below, 540; ii. 95).

[2] Fleay, *Stage*, 35, 45, 50. Mr. Fleay has conjectured the existence of a company under the patronage of Lord Charles Howard as early as 1572-3 (*Stage*, 33). This conjecture is apparently based on Mr. Fleay's identification of *Theagines and Cariclia*, acted at Court, 1572-3, with *The Queen of Ethiopia*, acted by the Lord Charles Howard's men at Bristol in 1578 (*Stage*, 20 *n.*). But the identification is based on very slight evidence, and, even if correct, does not prove that Lord Charles Howard had a company of players in his service in 1572-3, for the play might easily have passed from some other company to Howard's men after 1574. Mr. Fleay evidently does not care to force the point, for his statements on page 20 (*Stage*) imply that the play passed from some other company to Howard's men after 1572-3), and on page 368 (*Stage*) he gives 1574 as the earliest date for Howard's company, then acting as Lord Chamberlain's men.

[3] Cf. below, 301.

which, under the title of 'Her Ma^ties poor Players,' petitioned the Privy Council to request the Lord Mayor and the Justices of Middlesex to permit them to act in London, for the players stated that only by so doing could they perfect themselves for acting before the Queen,[1] and the Lord Chamberlain's company acted at Court during Christmas, 1575-6.

From 1577 to 1583 this company acted as the Lord Charles Howard's men. Under this title they appeared both at Court and in the provinces during 1577 and 1578. Though they are not mentioned as acting in the city of London during these years, they doubtless did so, for on Dec. 24, 1578, the Privy Council ordered the Lord Mayor 'to suffer the children of her Majesty's chapel, the servants of the Lord Chamberlain (*i.e.* Earl of Sussex), of the Earl of Warwick, of the Earl of Leicester, and the children of Paul's, and no companies else, to exercise plays within the city; whom their Lordships have only allowed thereunto, by reason that the companies aforenamed are appointed to play this Christmas before her Majesty.'[2] The obvious implication of this order is that other companies than those mentioned had been acting in London in 1578. Among these, no doubt, was the Lord Charles Howard's company. As these men did not act at Court from Christmas, 1577-8, till Christmas, 1585-6, and could not plead as an excuse for their acting in the city that they were preparing plays to show before the Queen, they were probably forced to act outside the city walls. In the provinces they appeared at Coventry, Ipswich, Bath, and probably Notting-

[1] Collier, i. 212-213.

[2] Chalmers, *Apology*, 373.

ham, during 1578-9, and at Ipswich in 1581. From 1581 to 1585 this company is not mentioned at Court, in London, or in the provinces.

After the death of the Lord Chamberlain, Thomas Ratcliffe, Earl of Sussex, on June 9, 1583, Lord Charles Howard was appointed Lord Chamberlain. This position he held till July 4, 1585, when he was appointed Lord High Admiral.[1] From 1585 to 1603 his company of players are usually styled the Lord Admiral's men.

In June, 1585, these players acted at Dover, and on Jan. 6, 1586, they appeared at Court. From 1585-6 to 1603 this company played frequently at Court, in London, and in the provinces. On Jan. 25, 1587, the Admiral's men are mentioned as one of the leading London companies, for on that date a spy of Walsingham's wrote that the companies of the Queen, the Earl of Leicester, the Earl of Oxford, and the Lord Admiral, and divers others set up players' bills in the city every day in the week, 'so that when the bells toll to the Lecturer, the trumpets sound to the stages to the Joy of the wicked faction of Rome.' This apparently refers only to the setting up of the players' bills, and does not mean that the companies acted in the city on Sunday, for this writer, probably thinking of acting in the city on Sunday, says in the

[1] Fleay, *Stage*, 30-31; Stow, 709. Lord Charles Howard's sympathy with players was rather markedly shown in 1584. On Sunday, 14th of June, 1584, 'My Lord (*i.e.* the Lord Mayor) sent two Aldermen to the Court for the suppressing and pulling downe of the Theatre and Curten; for all the Lords agreed thereunto saving my Lord Chamberlain (*i.e.* L. Charles Howard) and Mr. Vice Chamberlain, but we obtained a letter to suppress them all' (Fleay, *Stage*, 55; Halliwell-Phillipps, *Illustrations*, 41; Collier, i. 252-253; *Lansdowne MSS.*, 41). The Theatre and the Curtain were not pulled down at this time.

same letter, 'the profaning of the Sabbath is redressed, but as bad a custom entertained.' [1]

Whether or not the Admiral's men performed in the 'liberties' as well as in the 'city' of London during 1587 is uncertain. If so, they were probably one of the companies about whom the inhabitants of Southwark complained in October, 1587, that they acted plays on Sunday, 'especially within the liberty of the Clink, and within the parish of St. Saviours.' The result of this complaint was that on October 29, the Privy Council ordered the magistrates of Surrey and Middlesex to put down all such Sunday performances. This order, if ever rigidly enforced, seems after a time to have been disregarded, for on Sunday, June 11, 1592, a riot occurred in Southwark, headed by the servants of the Feltmakers' Company and others, to rescue a prisoner from the Marshalsea, and the next day the Lord Mayor wrote to Lord Burghley that 'the sayed companies assembled themselves by occasion and pretence of their meeting at a play, which besides the breach of the Sabboth day, giveth opportunitie of committing these and such like disorders.' [2]

About November 5, 1589, all players within the city of London were ordered to stop playing, as a result of the Martin Marprelate controversy. One of these companies, as is learned from a letter of Nov. 6, 1589, to Lord Burghley from the Lord Mayor, was the Lord Admiral's company. This company, in contrast to the Lord Strange's men, who defied the Lord Mayor, submitted without a

[1] Fleay, *Stage*, 91 ; Collier, i. 257-258.
[2] Collier, i. 270-271.

protest.[1] The prohibition of Nov. 1589 was probably not long enforced against the Lord Admiral's men, for on Dec. 23 they showed feats of activity at Court, and on March 3 performed a regular play before the Queen.

Though the first sure mention of an actor belonging to the Admiral's company occurs on May 6, 1593, when Edward Alleyn, 'servant to the Lord High Admiral,' appeared in a travelling company under the patronage of Lord Strange,[2] it is probable that Edward Alleyn, John Alleyn, and James Dunstan left the Earl of Worcester's company about January 3, 1589, to join the Admiral's men. Most likely it was for the Admiral's company that John and Edward Alleyn on that date bought Richard Jones's share of the 'playing apparels, play-books, instruments and other commodities,' which had been owned by Robert Browne, Richard Jones, John Alleyn, and Edward Alleyn.[3] Edward Alleyn probably began acting with Lord Strange's men when they opened at Henslowe's theatre, the Rose. This was only a temporary arrangement, as Alleyn still remained a Lord Admiral's man. He most likely rejoined the Admiral's men on May 14, 1594, when they began to act at the Rose.[4] This arrangement between Lord Strange's and the Lord Admiral's companies is not surprising because of the intimate relations of these companies from 1592 to 1598.[5]

Early in 1592 the Admiral's company left London for the provinces. On Feb. 3 they appeared at

[1] Collier, i. 265.
[2] Cf. above, 87-88.
[3] *Ibid.*, 47-48.
[4] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 13, 17.
[5] Cf. above, 62.

Shrewsbury, and probably about the same time at Bath. By March 7 they were at Ipswich, and on Dec. 19 in Leicester. If after this they returned to London, they cannot have acted in the city very long, for about Feb. 1, 1593, all plays seem to have been stopped in London on account of the plague.[1] The company must have left London soon afterwards, for they were in York by April. During the year they also acted at Coventry, Norwich, and Shrewsbury. Whether or not they returned to London for the winter season of 1593-4 is uncertain. There are no records of their being at Court or in the City. Between Sept. 10, 1593, and May 14, 1594, they acted at Bath. Nothing more is heard of them in the provinces during 1593-4.

On May 14, 1594, the Lord Admiral's company began acting in London under Henslowe's management, probably at the Rose.[2] They do not seem to have remained at this theatre after May 16, for on that date Henslowe's account with them ceased temporarily. On June 3 Henslowe opened a new account with the Admiral's and Lord Chamberlain's companies, who then began acting at 'Newington.'[3] There is nothing to show why these companies acted at 'Newington' instead of the Rose. Possibly the latter theatre was undergoing some repairs, which interfered with its use for plays. As there was practically no plague in London in 1594, fear of infection cannot have been the reason. On June 15 the Admiral's company seems to have returned to the Rose, for (*a*) After June 13, 1594,

[1] Cf. above, 87.
[2] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 17.
[3] *Ibid.*

though Henslowe has not entered a new heading stating that the Admiral's men then returned to the Rose, he has drawn a line which indicates some break in the accounts ;[1] (*b*) After June 13, no play which can be traced to the Lord Chamberlain's company is mentioned in the account ; (*c*) On Oct. 8, 1594, the Lord Chamberlain's men were certainly not playing at the Rose, for on that date their patron, Lord Hunsdon, asked permission for them to continue playing at the Cross Keys.[2] As there are no breaks in Henslowe's account from June 15, 1594, to March 14, 1595, the Chamberlain's men must have ceased acting under his management before June 15, 1594 ; (*d*) The increase in Henslowe's receipts from June 15 can only be accounted for by supposing that the company under his management then occupied a better playing place than 'Newington.'[3]

[1] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 17. [2] Cf. above, 93.

[3] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 17. The receipts from June 3 to June 13 at Newington were viiis., xs., xiis., xis., xviis., viiis., vs., ixs., viis., iiiis. After June 15 (*i.e.* at the Rose ?) they were iiili. iiiis., xxxvs., xxiis., liiis., xxxs., etc. The only evidence which at first sight appears to be against the theory of the separation of the Admiral's and Lord Chamberlain's companies on June 13, and the return of the Admiral's company to the Rose on June 15, 1594, is that William Sly on Oct. 11, 1594, bought a jewel from Henslowe (*Diary*, ed. Greg, 29), and among the properties of the Admiral's men on March 13, 1598, occurs the item :—'Item, Perowes sewt, which W^m^ Sley were' (*Diary*, ed. Collier, Appendix, 275). Now as William Sly is never heard of except as a Strange-Chamberlain's man, these entries may indicate that the Strange-Chamberlain company was connected with Henslowe and the Admiral's men about Oct. 1594. But this is highly improbable, for (*a*) Sly was much too important an actor not to appear in the actor-lists of the Admiral's men from 1594 to 1598 if he had been a member of that company (in the 1592 (?) list of the Strange-Chamberlain company he appeared in the important part of Porrex in the Tartleton's *Seven Deadly Sins*, Pt. 2 ; in the 1598 list of the company he occupies the seventh place, and in the 1599 list the fifth place, cf. above, 101, 103).

As stated above, Edward Alleyn, John Alleyn, and James Dunstan probably joined the Admiral's men about January 3, 1589.[1] From Feb. 19, 1592, to May 14, 1594, Edward Alleyn, though still connected with the Admiral's men, seems to have been acting with the Strange-Chamberlain company. On May 14, 1594, he probably rejoined the Admiral's men.[2] John Alleyn, if an actor, most likely left the Admiral's company before December, 1594, as his name does not appear in the list of these men for that date.[3] As early as 1586 he was described as a 'Citizen and Inholder of London.'[4] As late as May 6, 1591, he was interested financially in the stage, for he then joined his brother, Edward Alleyn, in buying a cloak for use in theatrical performances.[5] Probably he was at this time still a member of the Admiral's company. He may have remained with the company till about 1594, when he 'became a distiller and resided in the parish of St. Andrew, Holborn.'[6]

In December, 1594, Henslowe entered the following list of the Admiral's men in his *Diary* :—

Edward Alleyn.
John Singer.

(*b*) Sly might have bought a jewel from Henslowe even though he were not a member of a company under Henslowe's management. (*c*) The coat which Sly wore as Pero (in what play the character appeared is unknown) may have been bought from the Strange-Chamberlain's company for the Admiral's men, and so appeared among their properties in 1598. This evidence, then, which seems to be against the separation of the Admiral's and the Strange-Chamberlain's companies on June 13, 1594, is really of no importance.

[1] Cf. above, 114. [2] *Ibid.*
[3] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 5.
[4] Collier, *Alleyn Papers*, Shak. Soc. Pub., 2.
[5] *Ibid.*, 12-13.
[6] Collier, *Memoirs of Edward Alleyn*, Shak. Soc. Pub., 4.

Richard Jones.
Thomas Towne.
Martin Slaughter.
Edward Juby.
Thomas Dutton.
James Dunstan.[1]

In addition to these men 'mr shealden player,' who witnessed for Henslowe his loan to Richard Fuller on August 24, 1594,[2] may have been an Admiral's man. Gabriel Spenser and Humphrey and Antony Jeffes were also, very probably, members of the Admiral's company.[3]

From June 15, 1594, till June 26, 1595, the Admiral's company acted continuously at the Rose, except during the Lenten season, from March 14 to April 21, 1595.[4] From June 26 to August 25, 1595, they travelled, acting at Maidstone and Bath. On August 25, 1595, they again opened at the Rose, and acted there till July 18, 1596. During this year the Lenten closing of the theatre was from Feb. 28 to April 12.[5] After July 18, 1596, they travelled, appearing at Bath, Gloucester, and Coventry. On Oct. 27, 1596, the company again began playing at the Rose. Except from Nov. 15 to Nov. 25, 1596, and during Lent, when the Rose was closed from Feb. 12 to March 3, they acted continuously till July 28, 1597.[6] As Lord Charles

[1] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 5. Mr. Collier mistakenly includes 'lame Charles Alen' in this list (Collier, *Diary*, Shak. Soc. Pub., 6). Edward Alleyn and 'lame Charles Alen' are mentioned as witnesses to Henslowe's loan to John Shepherd and the preceding transactions, and not as members of the Admiral's company.

[2] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 76.

[3] Cf. ii. 122 f.

[4] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 17-24.

[5] *Ibid.*, 24-42.

[6] *Ibid.*, 49-54.

Howard was created Earl of Nottingham in October, 1596, the company sometimes appeared under that title from 1596 to 1603.

Among the Alleyn papers at Dulwich College was a plot of *Frederick and Basilea*, which contains a fairly complete list of the Admiral's company.[1] The date of this plot is easily fixed, for it was a new play on June 3, 1597, when it was acted by the Admiral's men at the Rose.[2] It was again acted on June 9, 18, and July 4. After July 4 it is not mentioned.[3] The plot must have been made before July 18, for it contains the name of Martin Slaughter, who left the Admiral's men on that day.[4] Consequently the date of the plot must be between June 3 and July 18, 1597. In all probability June 3 is the correct date, for, as the play seems to have been acted only four times, there is little likelihood of any change in the cast between June 3 and July 4. The plot, with characters and actors arranged tabularly, and conjectural names from the lists of the Admiral's men for December, 1594, October, 1597, and March 18, 1598, is as follows :—

[1] This plot is now in the British Museum, numbered Additional MS., 10,449. Fleay supposes the plot to be lost (*Stage*, 141).

[2] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 53. Henslowe marked 'ne' opposite the play on June 3. This is his way of indicating that it was a new play.

[3] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 53.

[4] *Ibid.*, 54, and below, 122.

## PLOT OF 'FREDERICK AND BASILEA' [June 3, 1597][1]

Prologue. RICHARD ALLEN

| *Characters.* | *Actors.* |
|---|---|
| SEBASTIAN, | Mr. [EDWARD] ALLEN. |
| The KING, | Mr. EDWARD JUBY. |
| GOVERNOR, | Mr. [JAMES] DUNSTAN. |
| MYRON HAMET, | Mr. [THOMAS] TOWNE. |
| THEODORE, | Mr. MARTIN [SLAUGHTER]. |
| HERACLIUS, | Mr. SAM. [ROWLEY]. |
| TAMAR, the Moor, | Mr. CHARLES [MASSEY]. |
| FREDERICK, | RICHARD ALLEN. |
| Jailors, Messengers, | BLACK DICK [JONES]. |
| Guards, Servants, | THOMAS HUNT. |
| Confederates, Lords, | The GATHERERS. |
| PEDRO, | ROBERT LEDBETER. |
| ANDREO, | PIG. |
| PHILIPPO, | EDWARD DUTTON. |
| ATHANASIA, | GRIFFIN. |
| LEONORA, | WILL[2] [BORNE *alias* BIRDE]. |
| BASILEA, | E. DUTTON'S boy; DICK. |

Epilogue. RICHARD ALLEN.

A comparison of this list of the Admiral's men with the company of December, 1594, shows that though John Singer, Thomas Dutton, and, if they were members of the 1594 company, Gabriel Spenser, Humphrey Jeffes, Antony Jeffes, and Sheldon, are not mentioned in June, 1597, the following new names are found, Mr Sam. [Rowley], Mr Charles [Massey], Richard Allen, Thomas Hunt, Robert Ledbeter, Pig [nickname], Edward Dutton, Griffin [a boy], Will [a boy], and Dick, E. Dutton's boy. John Singer, Thomas Dutton, and probably Spenser and the two Jeffes, were still members of the company,

[1] Fleay, *Stage*, 141; Malone by Boswell, iii., facing 357.

[2] Mr. Fleay conjectures that 'Will' was 'little Will Barne' or William Borne. For a discussion of this theory, cf. below, 134.

though they did not act in *Frederick and Basilea*, for they are all mentioned by Henslowe as Admiral's men on Oct. 11, 1597.[1] After August 24, 1594, nothing further is heard of Sheldon in this or any other dramatic company. How many of the actors mentioned in *Frederick and Basilea*, and not in the list of December, 1594, joined the company between 1594 and 1597, there is no evidence to show.

On July 27, 1597, Henslowe hired Thomas Hearne to play with the Admiral's men for two years at a wage of five shillings a week for the first year and six shillings and eightpence a week for the second year. The agreement was witnessed by John Singer, James Dunstan, and Thomas Towne.[2] On August 3, 1597, Henslowe bound John Heele, the clown, 'to contenew w$^{th}$ me at my howsse in playinge tylle srafte tyd next.'[3] The agreement was witnessed by Edward Alleyn, John Singer, James Dunstan, Edward Juby, and Samuel Rowley. This is the last time James Dunstan is mentioned as connected with any dramatic company.[4]

Edward Alleyn seems to have temporarily 'left playing' between June and October, 1597, though he

[1] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 82. There is further evidence that John Singer was an Admiral's man in July, 1597. On July 25 he borrowed 20s. of Henslowe, and on July 27 John Singer, James Dunstan, and Thomas Towne, as representatives of the Admiral's company, witnessed the agreement between Henslowe and Thomas Hearne (*Ibid.*, 201).

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Ibid.* 'Srafte tyd next' is probably Shrovetide, 1598.

[4] Mr. Fleay, in giving the lists of the Admiral's men from Henslowe's *Diary*, says that Dunstan is 'mentioned, 1596, Dec. 11' (*Stage*, 142), the obvious implication being that after that date Dunstan ceased acting with the Admiral's men. Yet in his actor-list (*Stage*, 371) he dates Dunstan as an Admiral's man, '1594-7.' Of these contradictory statements the second is the correct one.

still was interested in the affairs of the Admiral's men, and continued to witness agreements between them and Henslowe.[1] This appears from Henslowe's entry of about Dec. 29, 1597, 'A not of all suche goods as J haue Bowght for playnge sence my sonne Edward Allen leafte laynge.'[2] As E. Alleyn played Sebastian in *Frederick and Basilea* c. June 3, and does not appear in the list of the Admiral's men for Oct. 11, 1597, he must have stopped playing with the company between those dates. He most likely played with the company till July 28, 1597, when the Admiral's men ceased acting at the Rose.[3]

On July 18, 1597, Martin Slaughter probably left the Admiral's company, for Henslowe entered in his *Diary*, 'marten slather went for [*i.e.* from] the company of my lord admeralles men the 18 of July 1597.'[4] 'For' is a likely slip for 'from,' and the history of Slaughter after July, 1597, points to his having left the company then. After July, 1597, Slaughter does not appear in any list of these men. In March, 1598, he was engaged in a lawsuit against William Bcrne or Birde, Thomas Dutton, and Gabriel Spenser, of the Admiral's company, possibly to obtain from them his share of the theatrical properties which they had owned in common as Admiral's men.[5] On May 16, 1598, the Admiral's men borrowed seven pounds from Henslowe to buy from Slaughter five books 'called ij ptes of heroclus & focas & pethagores & elyxander & lodicke

[1] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 202 f. [2] *Ibid.*, 81.
[3] *Ibid.*, 54. For a full discussion of E. Alleyn's connection with the Admiral's men during and after 1597, cf. ii. 131 f.
[4] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 54. [5] *Ibid.*, 73.

w^ch^ laste boock he hath not yet delyuered."[1] Not till July 18, when Henslowe paid Slaughter an additional twenty shillings, did the company receive '*elexsander & lodwicke.*'[2] These facts seem to show that after July 18, 1597, Martin Slaughter was not an actor in the Admiral's company.

The Admiral's company then, when it stopped playing at the Rose on July 28, 1597, seems to have contained the following players :—

*Men.* Edward Alleyn.
Edward Juby.
James Dunstan.
Thomas Towne.

[1] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 86.

[2] *Ibid.*, 90. Collier suggests as an alternative to the reading of 'for' as 'from' in Henslowe's entry of July 18, 1597, and the consequent theory that Martin Slaughter's then left the company, that Henslowe may mean that on July 18 Slaughter paid the Master of the Revels for the company (*Diary*, ed. Collier, 90). This is impossible because the Master of the Revels was paid on the 17th, not the 18th, as Mr. Greg's transcript of *Diary* shows (54). The entry stands thus :—

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ' | 16 | | tt at frenshe comodey . | 00 | 09 | 00-14-00 | |
| marten slather went for the company of my lord admeralles men the 18 of July 1597. | 0 | m^r^ pd | | | | | |
| | 18 | ——— | tt at wisman . . | 01 | 10 | 00-00-00 | .' |

'0' is probably Henslowe's way of indicating Sunday, which came on July 17, 1597. Collier omits the '0' and enters 'M^r^ pd' opposite the 16th. Collier also supposes that Slaughter was either the author or retoucher of the two parts of Hercules, Focas, Pythagoras and Alexander, and Lodowick (*Diary*, ed. Collier, 51 *n.* 3 ; 123 *n.* 3). In this supposition Mr. A. W. Ward seems to follow Collier, for he says, 'Martin Slater (the name is variously spelt), with whom Henslowe had many dealings, seems as a dramatic author to have dealt occasionally with classical themes of a very lofty sort' (*History*, ii. 608). But, as Slaughter is never definitely mentioned as an author, the above references probably mean that these plays were in his possession and nothing more.

Samuel Rowley.
Charles Massey.
Richard Allen.
Richard Jones.
Thomas Hunt.
Robert Ledbeter.
Pig [nickname].
Edward Dutton.
John Singer.
Gabriel Spenser.
Humphrey Jeffes.
Antony Jeffes.
Thomas Hearne.
John Heele (clown).
Thomas Dutton.

*Boys.* Griffin.
Will.
Dick; E. Dutton's boy.

On July 28, 1597, the Privy Council ordered that 'there be no more plaies used in any publique place within three myles of the Citty untill Alhallontide next.'[1] As late as August 6, Henslowe seems to have been doubtful about the enforcing of this order,[2] but by August 10 all doubt was removed,[3] and it became evident that all plays were to be stopped for the summer. Probably the Admiral's men travelled, for Henslowe in his August agreement with Richard Jones speaks of the company playing in the county in case the Restraint was enforced.[4]

This Restraint was removed most likely shortly

[1] Halliwell-Phillipps, *Illustrations*, 21.
[2] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 202. [3] *Ibid.*, 203. [4] *Ibid.*, 202.

before October 11, 1597, for on that date the Admiral's and Pembroke's men began to act at the Rose.[1] Pembroke's men probably left the Rose on Nov. 5.[2] Henslowe gives the following partial list of the Admiral's men for Oct. 11, 1579 :—

William Borne.
Gabriel Spenser.
Robert Shaw.
Richard Jones.
Thomas Dutton.
Edward Juby.
Thomas Towne.
John Singer.
Humphrey Jeffes.
Antony Jeffes.[3]

Since July 28, 1597, the company had probably lost Edward Alleyn and James Dunstan, and had gained Robert Shaw.[4] Otherwise the company was most likely much the same as on July 28. On December 18, 1597, Henslowe bought the boy James Bristow 'of william agusten player' for eight pounds.[5] Bristow no doubt was made to serve his turn in the Admiral's company.

During Christmas, 1597-8, these men acted twice at Court, their first performances there since 1590-1. On Feb. 19, 1598, the Privy Council sent a letter to the Master of the Revels and the Justices of Peace for Middlesex and Surrey, in which they stated that the Admiral's and the Chamberlain's were the only authorised companies in London, and ordered that

[1] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 54. [2] Cf. above, 68-70.
[3] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 82. [4] *Ibid.*, 202. [5] *Ibid.*, 203.

all other companies be suppressed. The reason given for the authorisation of the Admiral's and Chamberlain's companies was that they were preparing themselves to act before the Queen.[1]

On March 8, 1598, the company, which seems to have been acting continuously at the Rose since October 11, 1597, balanced its account with Henslowe, and the following members of the company signed their names :—

John Singer.
Thomas Dutton.
William Birde (*i.e.* Borne).
Robert Shaw.
Gabriel Spenser.
Thomas Towne.
Humphrey Jeffes.
Richard Jones.
Charles Massey.
Samuel Rowley.[2]

As these men assumed the responsibility of the company's debt to Henslowe, they were probably the shareholders of the company.

From March 8, 1598, to July 10, 1600, the Admiral's men seem to have played, with practically no break, at the Rose.[3] On March 25, 1598, Richard Alleyn bound himself to Henslowe as 'a hiered servante' for two years. The agreement was witnessed by William Borne, Thomas Dutton, Gabriel Spenser, Robert Shaw, and Richard Jones. On the same day Thomas Heywood agreed to play at

[1] Cf. Collier, i. 298.
[2] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 84.
[3] *Ibid.*, 84-122.

the Rose for two years as a 'covenante searvante' to Henslowe. The witnesses were Antony Monday, William Borne, Gabriel Spenser, Thomas Dutton, Robert Shaw, Richard Jones, and Richard Alleyn.[1] About Sept. 22, 1598, Ben Jonson killed Gabriel Spenser in 'hogesden fylldes.'[2] On Sept. 27, 1598, the company seems to have been called to Croydon to help entertain the Queen, who was visiting the Lord Admiral there.[3]

The shareholders of the Admiral's company signed an agreement with Henslowe on July 10, 1600, in which they acknowledged themselves his debtors for three hundred pounds, and promised payment. The signatures, which are autograph, are arranged thus :—

'J Singger

Robt shaa
Thomas Downton Thomas towne
W birde.

Humfrey Jeffes

Edward Jubye
Anthony Jeffes Richard Jones
Charles massye
Samuel Rowley'[4]

[1] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 204. For a full discussion of Heywood's connection with the company, cf. ii. 141 f.

[2] ii. 272.

[3] In the *Diary* (ed. Greg, 72) is the following entry :—'lent w$^{m}$ borne the 27 of septemb3 when he Reade to croyden to ther lorde when the quene came thether—v$^{s}$.' On March 29, 1598, Borne, *alias* Birde, was under arrest, and on Aug. 30 he was engaged in a lawsuit with Thomas Pope. In these affairs of Borne the company as a whole apparently had no interest.

[4] *Dairy*, ed. Greg, 123. The order of names given by Fleay (*Stage*, 142) from Collier's edition of the *Diary* (172) is inaccurate.

Thomas Dutton's boy is mentioned on June 5, 1600, as playing in *Cupid and Psyche*.[1]

On January 8, 1600, Henslowe and E. Alleyn entered into an agreement with Peter Street, carpenter, for the building of the Fortune Theatre in Golden Lane, St. Giles, without Cripplegate.[2] Street agreed to have the theatre finished by July 25, 1600, but it was probably not completed till about Nov. 26, 1600, when Henslowe with some asperity entered in his *Diary* an item of thirty shillings 'in fulle payment of all Recknengs from the begynge of the world vnto the daye of the datte hereof, etc.'[3]

When the Admiral's men, for whom the new theatre was intended by Henslowe and Alleyn, began acting there is uncertain. On June 22, 1600, the Privy Council sent orders to the Lord Mayor and the Justices of Middlesex and Surrey for the closing of all theatres but two, the Globe on the Surrey side, to be occupied by the Lord Chamberlain's men, and in Middlesex, the theatre which is 'nowe in hand to be builte by the said Edward Allen,' and 'is not intended to encrease the nombre of the playhouses, but to be insteade of another, namely the Curtayne, which is ether to be ruyned and plucked downe or put to some other good use.' This new theatre was to be occupied by the Lord Admiral's men. On both sides of the river plays were to be given on only two days in the week, and not on Sunday, during Lent, or when there was any 'extraordinary sicknes

[1] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 122.

[2] Halliwell-Phillipps, *Outlines*, i. 304-306. Fleay mistakenly states that the Fortune was to be finished by July 27, 1600 (*Stage*, 151).

[3] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 154. For various payments about the Fortune, cf. *Ibid.*, 153-160.

or infection of disease . . . in or about the cittie.'[1] As the Fortune was not ready for occupation on June 22, the authorities probably allowed the Admiral's men to continue acting at the Rose.[2] From July 10 to August 14 this company seems to have travelled in the provinces, for, during 1599-1600, this is the only time that they are not heard of in London, and they appeared at Canterbury in 1599-1600. On August 14, 1600, Henslowe opened a new account with the Admiral's men, lending them money to buy theatrical properties on August 14, 16, 29, and September 2, 6, 12.[3] Evidently, then, the company was in London again by August 14. Where they were acting is not known. As the Fortune was not yet ready, and there is no record of any other company occupying the Rose till Oct. 28,[4] the Admiral's men probably acted at the latter theatre till that date.

After leaving the Rose on Oct. 28, 1600, the Admiral's men most likely ceased acting till they were settled in their new theatre, the Fortune. The exact date of their occupancy of the Fortune is probably between Nov. 11, when the company seems to have been reorganised,[5] and Dec. 14, the latest possible date for the following undated entry, which must refer to the first week's receipts at the Fortune :—

'pd vnto my sonne alleyn for the firste weckes playe the xj parte of xvij$^{li}$ ix$^{s}$ w$^{ch}$ came to therti & ij shellings J saye pd, . . . xxxii$^{s}$.'[6]

[1] Halliwell-Phillipps, *Outlines*, i. 309-310.
[2] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 122.
[3] *Ibid.*, 124.
[4] *Ibid.*, 131.
[5] *Ibid.*, 124.
[6] *Ibid.*

In all probability acting began at the Fortune on Nov. 26, for, as mentioned above, on that day Henslowe made his last payment for the building of the Fortune,[1] and on that day he lent Mrs. William Borne, *alias* Birde, three pounds to free her husband from jail,[2] no doubt because the company required his services at the opening of their new theatre.

The Admiral's men acted, with short interruptions, at the Fortune from its opening till May 5, 1603.[3] On Feb. 7, 1602, the company balanced its account with Henslowe from July 10 [1601], and the following shareholders signed their names :—

'Jhon Singer
Thomas Downton
William Byrd
[John Singer]
Edward Juby
Thomas Towne
Humphrey Jeffes
Anthony Jeffes
Samuel Rowley
Charles Massy' [4]

Richard Jones and Robert Shaw, who had been shareholders in the Admiral's company, seem to have left it a few days before this account was made up, for Robert Shaw, who had been the company's man of business since he joined it in September, 1597, paid Chettle for revising the company's play,

[1] Cf. above, 128.
[2] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 80.
[3] *Ibid.*, 124-174.
[4] *Ibid.*, 164. The brackets about the second entry of John Singer's name indicate that it is crossed out in the MS.

'*The Prowde Womon*,' on Jan. 21, 1602,[1] and on Feb. 7 Henslowe noted at the end of his account with the company :—

> 'Lent vnto the company to geve vnto m^r. Jonnes & m^r. shaw at ther goinge a waye fyftye powndes w^ch is not in this Recknynge J saye, . . . . . [l]50^li.'[2]

Though not a member of the Admiral's men on Feb. 7, 1602, Shaw must have represented the company when they drew up their account with Henslowe on that date, for the names of the shareholders are written in his handwriting.[3]

On February 23, 1602, Henslowe began a new account with 'my lord of notingames men,'[4] which lasted till May 5, 1603.[5] During this period, Thomas Dutton and Edward Juby seem to have transacted most of the company's business.[6] A fairly complete list of the actors in the company is obtained from the plot of *I. Tamar Cam.* The date of this plot is almost certainly *c.* Oct. 2, 1602, when Henslowe bought the play from Edward Alleyn for the

[1] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 164. [2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Ibid.*, 232, *note F*, 104. Collier states that the names of the shareholders were written by John Singer (218 *n.*). It seems highly improbable that Singer, if he wrote the list, signed his own name twice. Besides Collier's inaccuracy throughout his edition of the *Diary* is enough to decide the matter against him.

Mr. Fleay supposes that Shaw and Jones left the Admiral's men on Sept. 29, 1600 (*Stage*, 142, 357. In contradiction to this theory he dates Jones, 'Adm. 1594-1601' on page 373, but this may be a slip). That is, he supposes they adhered exactly to their agreement with Henslowe to play at his 'howse' for three years from Sept. 29, 1597 (*Diary*, ed. Greg, 202). But as Shaw is constantly mentioned during 1601 as transacting business for the company (*Ibid.*, 137-164), and Shaw and Jones evidently left the company at the same time (*Ibid.*, 164), this theory is untenable.

[4] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 165. [5] *Ibid.*, 174.

[6] *Ibid.*, 165-174.

Admiral's company.[1] By a mistake, Henslowe also entered this play to Worcester's men, who were acting at the Rose in October, 1602, but he afterwards crossed out this entry.[2] *I. Tamar Cam* was acted by the Admiral's men as a new play on May 6, 1596, and performed by them ten times between that date and November 13, 1596.[3] Some time after this it must have come into Edward Alleyn's possession, and on Oct. 2, 1602, he sold it to the Admiral's men for revival. That the plot belongs to the time of this revival there can be little doubt, for, (*a*) William Cartwright and William Parr are mentioned as members of the company. These men do not appear in any previous list of the company, though they are found in several subsequent lists ;[4] (*b*) Martin Slaughter, who was a member of the company, probably till July, 1597, does not appear in the plot; (*c*) James Dunstan, probably an Admiral's man in 1597, and Richard Jones, a member of the company from 1594 to *c.* July, 1602, are not mentioned; (*d*) If the 'Will' of June, 1597, who acted Leonora in *Frederick and Basilea*, be the Mr. [Will] Burne of the *I. Tamar Cam* plot, as seems probable,[5] his advancement to the position of a shareholder shows that *I. Tamar Cam* is later than June, 1597;[6] (*e*) Richard Alleyn, who was one of the Admiral's men from 1597 till his death, *c.* September, 1598, is not mentioned in the *I. Tamar Cam* list. The plot of *I. Tamar Cam* can then be almost

[1] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 171.
[2] *Ibid.*, 182.
[3] *Ibid.*, 30-49.
[4] Cf. below, 209 f.
[5] *Ibid.*, 134.
[6] In mixed lists of the players of a company Henslowe seems to have indicated the shareholders by placing 'Mr.' before their names.

certainly dated *c.* Oct. 2, 1602. From it is obtained the following list of the actors in the Admiral's company, and their parts :—

PLOT OF *I. TAMAR CAM.*[1]

| | |
|---|---|
| Mr. [Edward] Allen, | Tamar Cam. |
| Mr. [Edward] Juby, | Pitho, a Satyr. |
| Mr. [Thomas] Towne, | Persian Shah ; Oracle. |
| Mr. Sam. [Rowley], | Ascalon, a Spirit. |
| Mr. Charles [Massey], | Artaxes. |
| Mr. [John] Singer, | Assinego, the Clown. |
| Mr. Thomas Denygten [Downton or Dutton]. | Mango Cam. |
| Dick Juby, | Trebassus; Chorus; Spirit. |
| Will. Cartwright, | Nobleman, etc. |
| Tho. Marbeck, | Pontus, a Spirit, etc. |
| William Parr, | Scout, Trumpet, etc. |
| Mr. [William] Burne, | Colmogra. |
| Humphrey Jeffes, | Otanes. |
| Antony Jeffes, | Linus, a Satyr. |
| Thomas Parsons, | Nurse, Messenger, etc. |
| George, | Guard, Attendant, etc. |
| [Little Will. Barne], | Tarmia. |
| Jack Jones, | Palmeda. |
| Jack Gregory, | Tarmia's Children ; |
| Mr. Denygten's little boy, | Heron and Thia, nymphs. |

At the end of *Tamar Cam* came the following procession :—

1. The Tartars, Mr. Towne and Mr. Denygten.
2. The Getes, Gideon and Gibbs.
3. The Amazons, Jack Gregory and little Will.
4. The Negars, Tho. Rowley and the red-faced fellow.
5. The olive-coloured Moors, A. Jeffes and Mr. Juby.
6. The Cannibals, Kester and old [E.] Brown.
7. The Hermaphrodites, James [Bristow] and Parsons.
8. The Bohars, W. Parr and W. Cartwright.

[1] Fleay, *Stage*, 141 ; from Malone by Boswell, iii., opposite page 356. The names in brackets are either filled in from other lists of the company or conjectural.

9. The Pigmies, Giles's boy and little Will Barne.
10. The Cyrmms, Mr. Sam and Ned Brown.
11. The Cathayans, Dick Juby and George.
12. The Bactrians, [ ][1] and T. Marbeck.

Mr. Burne, who acted the part of Colmogra in *I. Tamar Cam*, was most likely William Borne or Bourne, *alias* Birde, a shareholder in the company since Oct. 11, 1597,[2] and a different person from 'little Will Barne,' who appeared as an Amazon and a pigmy in the procession, and may have taken the part of Tarmia in the play proper.[3] It was probably Mr. Borne *alias* Birde who as 'Will' played the part of Leonora in *Frederick and Basilea* on June 3, 1597,[4] for even after he became a shareholder in the company, he continued to play female parts,[5] and not 'little Will Barne,' who was obviously one of the boys in October, 1602.[6]

[1] According to Malone the name entered here was William Parr, which was erased and no other name entered. (Malone by Boswell, iii., opposite p. 356 *note*.)

[2] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 82.

[3] Fleay, *Stage*, 141. 'Little' was probably prefixed to Will Barne's name by the writer of the plot to show that he was a boy, and a different person from Mr. [William] Burne.

[4] Cf. above, 120.

[5] *The Diary* (ed. Greg, 69) contains the following entry, 'lent vnto Robart shawe to geue the tayller to bye tensell for bornes womones gowne the j of desemb$^{r}$, 1597, ix$^{s}$.' Borne *alias* Birde was certainly not a boy at this time. His agreement with Henslowe on August 10, 1597 (*Diary*, ed. Greg, 203), the fact that he was a shareholder in the second dramatic company in the kingdom by Oct. 11, 1597, and the certainty that he was married by Nov. 1600 (*Diary*, ed. Greg, 80. Borne may have been married early in 1599 to the mysterious widow with whom he and possibly Henslowe supped at Mrs. Reves's on Dec. 22, 1598, *Ibid.*, 78) show this clearly. Borne was probably master of a good falsetto voice, and so was enabled to continue acting female parts after he reached manhood.

[6] Mr. Fleay's statements about Mr. Burne of *I. Tamar Cam*, 1602, 'little Will Barne' of the same plot, and 'Will' of *Frederick and Basilea*, June, 1597, are by no means clear if not positively contradictory. On p. 141

'Old Brown,' who appeared in the procession of *I. Tamar Cam*, was probably Edward Brown, who, in 1599, seems to have been a member of the Admiral's company, for on January 25 of that year he, along with Henslowe and Charles Massey, witnessed an agreement between Thomas Dutton and his 'couenante servante.'[1] Edward Brown was one of the Earl of Worcester's men in 1583, and may have left that company for the Lord Charles Howard's, with Edward Alleyn, John Alleyn, and James Dunstan in 1589.[2] That his name does not appear in any of the lists of the Admiral's men till 1602 is not surprising, because those lists are always incomplete and usually contain only shareholders' names, and Brown never seems to have attained any position in his profession.[3]

(*Stage*) he conjectures that 'Will' who performed Leonora in *Frederick and Basilea* is 'Will' [Barne, boy], and that Mr. Burne of *I. Tamar Cam*, Oct., 1602, is Mr. [William] Burne. In a discussion of the dates of *I. Tamar Cam* and *Frederick and Basilea*, he says *I. Tamar Cam* 'is palpably later [*i.e.* than *Frederick and Basilea*]. Will Barne has become Mr. Burne' (*Stage*, 144). Why, if this is the case he did not write 'Will [Burne, boy]' in his conjecture for *Frederick and Basilea* is hard to understand. It looks as though he were thinking of 'little Will Barne' of the procession of *I. Tamar Cam* rather than of Mr. Burne of the play. The summary of the careers of 'little Will Barne' and 'William Bourne, Burne, *alias* Bird' in his list of actors (*Stage*, 370-371) makes his opinion still more enigmatical. There he writes :—

'Barne, little Will . . [Pem.] 1597.'
'William Bird . . . (Bourne). Adm., 1597-1603, etc.'

According to this, 'little Will Barne' was never an Admiral's man, yet he appeared in the procession of *I. Tamar Cam*, which was acted by the Admiral's company in 1602, and in that very play Mr. Fleay conjectures that he acted the part of Tarmia (*Stage*, 141). There is no evidence to show that either 'little Will Barne' or Mr. William Borne was ever connected with Pembroke's men.

[1] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 40.

[2] Cf. above, 47-48.

[3] It may be Edward Brown who is referred to in the *Diary* (ed. Greg, 45), when *c.* Oct. 14, 1596, Henslowe lent E. Alleyn, Martin Slaughter

'James,' who appeared as an Hermaphrodite in the procession of *I. Tamar Cam*, was probably the boy James Bristow, whom Henslowe bought from Augusten on December 18, 1597, for eight pounds,[1] and hired to the Admiral's company when they needed him, for there seems to have been no other actor in the company bearing the name James in 1602, and Bristow acted with this company from April 23, 1600, to February 15, 1601, apparently under the supervision of Antony Jeffes.[2]

During March, 1603, the Admiral's company visited Canterbury under the leadership of Thomas Dutton. They were given a reward of 30s., but were not allowed to play, because 'that o^r late Queene was then ether very sick or dead as they supposed.'[3] Soon after the Queen's death, on March 24, they in all probability returned to London, where they played at the Fortune till May 5.[4] Soon afterwards they passed under the patronage of Prince Henry.[5]

James Dunstan, and Edward Juby ten shillings 'to feache browne.' Mr. Fleay conjectures that 'old Brown' of *I. Tamar Cam* was Robert Brown (*Stage*, 141. Apparently he does not adhere to this in his Index List of actors, for he does not connect R. Brown with the Admiral's men). This conjecture is untenable, for R. Browne was on the Continent in October, 1602 (Herz, 18).

[1] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 203.

[2] *Ibid.*, 105, 134 (Collier in his edition of the *Diary*, p. 184, writes 3 of April for 23 of April in this entry), 106. About 1599 Richard Jones had a boy called 'James' (*Diary*, ed. Greg, 26). Possibly this 'James' is James Bristow, whom Henslowe had hired to Richard Jones for the time being, and who was transferred to Antony Jeffes after Jones left the company, *c.* July, 1602.

[3] Cf. ii. 230.

[4] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 174.

[5] Cf. below, 206.

## COURT PERFORMANCES

(Lord Charles Howard, Baron Howard of Effingham, acting Lord Chamberlain, 1574, *c.* April 24–1577, *c.* Feb. 2.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1574. December, . . | *The history of Phedrastus and Phigon* and *Lucia* together. | (Lord Chamberlain's players).[1] |
| 1576. [Jan.], . . . | | ( ,, ).[2] |
| 1576. Dec. 27, . . | *Toolie.* | (Lord Chas. Howard's players).[3] |
| 1577. Feb. 17, . . | *The Historie of the Solitarie Knight.* | ( ,, ).[4] |
| 1577-8. Christmas, '77, . . | | ( ,, ).[5] |

(Lord Charles Howard, Lord High Admiral, 1585, July 4–1619.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1586. Jan. 6, . . . | | (Lord High Admiral's players).[6] |
| 1589. Jan. 5, . . . | | ( ,, ).[7] |
| Feb. 9, . . . | | ( ,, ).[7] |
| Dec. 23, . . . | Showed feats of activity. | ( ,, ).[8] |
| 1590. March 3, . . | | ( ,, ).[8] |
| Dec. 27, . . . | | ( ,, ).[9] |
| 1591. Feb. 16, . . | | ( ,, ).[9] |

(Lord Charles Howard, Earl of Nottingham, 1596, Oct. 22–1624, Dec. 14.)

| | |
|---|---|
| 1597-8, . . . . | Two plays. (Earl of Nottingham's players).[10] |
| 1598-9. [*c.* August], . . | About the 9th of August, 1598, the Admiral's men seem to have been called on for a play at Court, and Antony Monday was hired to supply a suitable play within fourteen days.[11] There is no record of this performance at Court. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Christmas, . . . | The Admiral's company apparently expected in November, 1598, to perform *Robin Hood, Pt. I.*, at the Court during Christmas, 1598-99,[2] but there are no records of such a performance at Court. |
| 1599. April 7 . . | Thomas Towne and Richard Alleyn of the Admiral's men appear to have been called to Court on 'ester euen' to help in some dramatic performance.[13] |
| Dec. 27, . . . | *Fortunatus.* (Earl of Nottingham's players).[14] |
| 1600. Jan. 1, . . . | *The Shoemaker's Holiday.* ( „ ).[14] |
| Dec. 28, . . . | Dekker's *Phaeton* was given at one of these performances. (Lord Admiral's (players).[15] |
| 1601. Jan. 6, . . . | |
| Feb. 2, . . . | |
| 1602. Dec. 27, . . | [*Mery as may be*]. ( „ ).[16] |
| 1603. March 6, . . | [*Friar Bacon*]. ( „ ).[16] |
| [After March 6], . . | [*London Florentine*]. ( „ ).[16] |

## NOTES TO COURT PERFORMANCES

[1] Cunningham, *Revels*, 87. The rehearsal for this play was held on Dec. 14. Mr. Fleay conjectures the play to have been performed on Dec. 28 (*Stage*, 22). There is not evidence enough to establish this date. Mr. Fleay also conjectures that the Lord Charles Howard's men may have acted *Theagines and Chariclea* and *Fortune* at Court in 1572-3 (*Stage*, 33). For a discussion of this conjecture, cf. above, 110 *n.*

[2] Chalmers, *Apology*, 395. According to the Council Registers as quoted by Chalmers, the Lord Chamberlain's men were paid £10 on Jan. 7, 1576, for a play 'on Candlemas day, at night.' As Fleay points out (*Stage*, 24), either the Registers or Chalmers must be in error for, according to them, the Earl of Leicester's men played on Candlemas night, 1575, as did also the Children of Paul's under Sebastian Westcott (Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxi). Besides, that a play given on Feb. 2, 1575, should not be paid for till Jan. 7, 1576, is improbable.

[3] Cunningham, *Revels*, 102. This play was given at Hampton Court.

[4] Cunningham, *Revels*, 114. The Lord Charles Howard's men (also called 'Lord Chamberlain's' men) were paid £6, 13s. 4d. and given a reward of 5 marks on Feb. 20, 1577, for performing on Shrove Sunday (Chalmers, *Apology*, 396).

[5] Chalmers, *Apology*, 396. On Jan. 9, 1578, the company was paid £6, 13s. 4d. and given a reward of £3, 6s. 8d.

[6] Halliwell-Phillipps, *Illustrations*, 31. On Jan. 31 the company was paid. Mr. Fleay has entered a play at Court by the Lord Charles Howard's men on Feb. 2, 1578, paid for on March 14, 1578 (*Stage*, 26, 33). He has done this on the supposition that Lord Charles Howard was Lord Chamberlain at the time. For the supposition there seems to be no evidence.

[7] Chalmers, *Apology*, 399. On Feb. 27, 1589, the Admiral's men were paid £20 for two plays performed on 'the Sunday after Christmas day, and Shrove Sunday last.'

[8] Chalmers, *Apology*, 399. On March 10, 1590, the Admiral's men were paid £6, 13s. 4d. for showing 'feats of activity' before the Queen on December 23 ; also £6, 13s. 4d. for a play on 'Shrove-tuesday last' ; and a reward of £6, 13s. 4d.

[9] Chalmers, *Apology*, 400. On March 5, 1591, the Admiral's men were paid £13, 6s. 8d. and given a reward of £6, 13s. 4d. for playing two plays before the Queen on 'St. John's day, and Shrove-tuesday last.'

[10] Chalmers, *Apology*, 401. On Dec. 3, 1598, Robert Shaw and Thomas Dutton were paid £13, 6s. 8d. and given a reward of £6, 13s. 4d. for two plays by the 'servants of the Earl of Nottingham.'

[11] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 93. Mr. Fleay has conjectured that the play to be given was *Robin Hood, or the Death of Robert, Earl of Huntingdon, Pt.* 2 (*Drama*, ii. 115). There seems to be no evidence to support the conjecture.

[12] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 99. There is no reason to suppose that the words 'for mendinge of Roben hood for the corte' in the fifth entry on page 99 of the *Diary* is a forgery, as Fleay hints (*Stage*, 123).

[13] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 104. Possibly the whole Admiral's company were performing at Court during Easter, 1599. There are no other records of such a performance.

[14] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxiii ; Chalmers, *Apology*, 401. On Feb. 18, 1600, Robert Shaw was paid £20 and given a reward of £6, 13s. 4d. for 'Twoe Enterludes or Playes' at Court 'on St Johnes daye at night and Newyeares daye at night last.' Chalmers has 'John Shaw' for 'Robert Shaw,' gives the amount as 20 marks, has the payment of a reward which is not in Cunningham, and gives the company's name as the 'Lord Admiral's servants.' That the play presented on Jan. 1, 1600, was Dekker's *The Shoemaker's Holiday* is known from the title-page. The following entry in the *Diary* (ed. Greg, 116) shows that the play of Dec. 1599 was Dekker's *Old Fortunatus* :—

> 'pd vnto m$^{r}$ deckers, the 12 of desemb$^{r}$ 1599 for the eande of fortewnatus for the corte at the a poyntment of Robarte shawe the some of . . . . . xxxx$^{s}$.'

[15] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxiii. On March 31, 1601, Edward Alleyn was paid £30 for three 'playes' performed by the Admiral's men 'on Innocents day at night, Twelfth day at night, and Candelmas day at night last paste. On May 4, 1601, Alleyn handed £28, 10s. of this money to Henslowe, in part payment of the company's debt to him. The £1, 10s. he probably retained as his share, or had dispensed at Court in fees, as Cunningham

suggests. That the play performed on one of these occasions was Dekker's *Phaeton* is shown by the following entry :—

'Lent vnto Samewell Rowley the 22 of desemb$^{r}$ 1600 to geue vnto Thomas deckers for alterynge of fayton for the corte, xxx$^{s}$.'
(*Diary*, ed. Greg, 125.)

Apparently both the Lord Admiral's and the Lord Chamberlain's companies performed at Court on 'Twelfth day at night' (Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxiii. ; 'Strange-Chamberlain' Company Court List, above, 106). As this seems unlikely, perhaps the entries are inaccurate.

[16] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxiv. On April 22, 1603, Edward Allen and the rest of the Lord Admiral's company were paid £30 (*i.e.* £10 per play) for three plays performed on 'St. Johns day at night, Shrouesonday at night and —— at nighte last.' The plays given are indicated by the following entries in Henslowe's diary :—

(*a*) 'Lent vnto Edward Jube the [9] of novemb$^{r}$ 1602 to geue vnto John daye in earneste of a Boocke called mery as may be for the corte the some of . . . . . xxxx$^{s}$.'
(*Diary*, ed. Greg, 171.)

'Lent vnto Thomas downton the 17 of novemb$^{r}$ 1602 to paye vnto John daye & m$^{r}$ smythe & hathwaye in fulle paymente for a Boocke called as merey as may be the some of . . . . . vi$^{li}$.
(*Ibid.*)

(*b*) 'Lent vnto Thomas downton the 14 of decemb$^{r}$ 1602 to paye vnto m$^{r}$ mydelton for a prologe & a epeloge for the play of bacon for the corte the some of . . . v$^{s}$.'
(*Ibid.*, 172.)

(*c*) 'Lent vnto Thomas downton the 17 of desemb$^{r}$ 1602 to paye vnto harey chettell in earneste of a playe called london florenten the some of . . . . . x$^{s}$.'
(*Ibid.*)

'p$^{d}$ at the apoyntment of the company the 20 of desemb$^{r}$ 1602 vnto Thomas hewode in pt for his playe called london florentyn the some of . . . . . xxxx$^{s}$.'
(*Ibid.*)

'Lent vnto Thomas downton the 22 of desemb$^{r}$ 1602 to paye vnto harey chettell in fulle payment for his playe called the London florentyn the some of . . . . . iii$^{li}$.
(*Ibid.*)

'Lent vnto Thomas downton the 29 of desemb$^{r}$ 1602 to paye vnto harey chettell for a prologe & a epyloge for the corte the some of . . . . . v$^{s}$.'
(*Ibid.*, 173.)

Though the last entry does not name the play referred to, there can be little doubt that it was *The London Florentine*, because the entries are successive.

## PROVINCIAL VISITS

(Lord Charles Howard, Baron Howard of Effingham, acting Lord Chamberlain, 1574, *c.* April 24–1577, *c.* Feb. 2.)

| | |
|---|---|
| 1575-6, . . . . . | Ipswich. {(Lord Chamberlain's players). |
| August, '76, . . . | Bristol, play, *The Red Knight.* ( ,, ). |
| 1577-8. Oct. 24, '77, . . | Ipswich. {(Lord Charles Howard's players). |
| Dec. 3, '77, . . . | Kertling (Suffolk). ( ,, ). |
| December, '77, . . . | Bristol, play, *Queen of Ethiopia.* ( ,, ). |
| [1578-9. Dec. 19, '78, . . | Nottingham. ('Lord Haworth's' players)]. |
| Oct. 22, '78—Nov. 29, '79, . | Coventry. {(Lord Chas. Howard's players). |
| | Ipswich. ( ,, ). |
| July 11, '78—June 9, '79, . | Bath. ( ,, ). |
| 1581-2. Oct. 8, '81, . . . | Ipswich. ( ,, ). |

(Lord Charles Howard, Lord High Admiral, 1585, July 4—1619.)

| | |
|---|---|
| 1584-5. June 12–26, '85, . . | Dover. {(Lord High Admiral's players).[1] |
| 1585-6. Feb. 20, '86, . . | Ipswich. ( ,, ). |
| 1586, . . . . . | Cambridge. ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 30, '85–Nov. 15, '86, . | Coventry. ( ,, ). |
| [Before June 9, '86], . . | Leicester. ( ,, ). |
| [After Aug. 22, '86], . . | Faversham. ( ,, ). |
| 1586-7. May 26, '87, . . | Ipswich. ( ,, ). |
| | Norwich. ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 15, '86–Nov. 14, '87, . | Coventry. ( ,, ). |
| [Jan. 1–July 16, '87], . | Leicester. ( ,, ). |
| [June–Sept. 9, '87], . . | York. ( ,, ). |

[1] Unless the Scribe in Dover misdated this entry, Lord Charles Howard's men appeared in Dover as the Lord Admiral's men before their patron had officially received that appointment. Possibly the company knowing well that Lord Howard would soon be appointed Lord Admiral used that title before it was strictly theirs.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| [May–July 27, '87], . . | Southampton. | (Lord High Admiral's players). |
| | Exeter. | ( ,, ). |
| June 14, '86–June 14, '87, . | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| 1589-90, . . . . . | Ipswich (twice). | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 26, '89–Dec. [15], '90, . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 17, '89–Nov. 1, '90, . | Maidstone. | ( ,, ). |
| | Winchester. | ( ,, ). |
| July 25, '90, . . . | Marlborough. | ( ,, ). |
| Sept. 17, '90, . . . | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| 1590-91. [Before Feb., '91], . | Winchester. | ( ,, ). |
| | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| 1591-2. June 20, '91–June 10, '92, . . . . | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| Feb. 3, '92, . . . | Shrewsbury. | ( ,, ). |
| March 7, '92, . . . | Ipswich. | ( ,, ) |
| 1592-3. Dec. 19, '92, . . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 29, '92–Nov. 26, '93, . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| April '93, . . . . | York. | ( ,, ). |
| | Shrewsbury. | ( ,, ). |
| 1593-4. Sept. 10, '93-[Sept.], '94, | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| 1594-5. June 26–Aug. 25, '95, . | Maidstone. | ( ,, ). |
| | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| 1595-6. July 18–Oct. 27, '96, . | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| 1599-1600. July 10–Aug. 14, '00, | Canterbury. | ( ,, ). |
| 1602-3. *c.* March, '03, . . | Canterbury. | ( ,, ). |
| Dec. 20, '02–Nov. 27, '03, . | Coventry. | (Earl of Nottingham's players). |
| Aug. 18, '03, . . . | Leicester. | (Lord High Admiral's players). |
| | York. | ( ,, ). |
| 1603-4. [Oct.], '03–Oct. 14, '04, | Bath. | ( ,, ). |

# PART II

# GREATER MEN'S COMPANIES

## 1603-1642

# I

# 1, KING JAMES I.—1, KING CHARLES I.'s COMPANY[1]

## I

On May 5, 1603, the Admiral's men ceased playing 'now at the kynges cominge,'[2] and no doubt the other London companies, the Lord Chamberlain's among them, did the same. James arrived in London on May 7,[3] and by May 9 seems to have given the companies permission to act, for on that

[1] For 2, King James I. company, cf. ii. 6 f.; for 2, King Charles I. company, cf. below, 271 f.

[2] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 174.

[3] On the day of his arrival in London, James issued a proclamation against monopolies, etc. At its close are these words: 'And for that we are informed that there hath beene heretofore great neglect in this kingdome of keeping the Sabbath-day: For better observing of the same, and avoyding all impious prophanation, we do straightly charge and commaund, that no Beare-bayting, Bul-bayting, Enterludes, common Playes or other like disordered or unlawful Exercises, or Pastimes, be frequented, kept, or used at any time hereafter upon the Sabbath-day' (Collier, i. 341). How this proclamation of James's was received in the provinces is shown by an entry in the Leicester Records. On May 16 Henry Freeman, 'one of his Ma^ts^ Messengers,' came to Leicester, and announced that 'Beare baytinge, Bulbaytinge, Enterludes, Comon Playes, &c.' were prohibited on Sunday On May 19 the following verses were entered in the Hall Book:—

'The ffirst of May
Bing the Saboth day,
In Quene Maris time
It was a silver mine;
And in Quene Elizabethes tim'
A golden mine
And now it is colld
A leden mine
Worser than copper
A drossie mine.
God save Kyng James the fferst
and of Scotland the vj
(Thursdaye the 19th of Maye 1603).'

(*Notices of Leicester*, Kelly, 243-244).

date Worcester's men began to act at the Rose 'by the kynges licence.'[1]

On May 17, 1603, a Privy Seal licensed the Lord Chamberlain's men as the King's players. This Privy Seal was patented on May 19.[2] It mentioned the Globe as the company's usual place of acting, and permitted them to play not only in London but in 'anie towne halls, or mout halls, or other convenient places within the liberties and freedome of any other citie, universitie, towne, or borough whatsoever within our said realmes and dominions,' 'when the infection of the plague shall decrease.' It names nine members of the company, Laurence Fletcher, William Shakespeare, Richard Burbage, Augustine Phillipps, John Hemings, William Sly, Robert Armin and Richard Cowley, and refers to 'the rest of their associats.'[3]

This list, which probably contains the names of those actors who were shareholders, whether as housekeepers or actor-sharers,[4] indicates certain changes in the company since 1598-9.[5] Laurence Fletcher had joined the company as their leader, most likely about the time of James's accession to the English throne.[6] When Kempe left the company, probably about August, 1602,[7] Robert Armin, who was a Strange-Chamberlain man before August, 1600, succeeded him as the company's leading comic actor.[8] Thomas Pope, though still one of the house-

[1] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 190.

[2] Collier, i. 334-335 *n.*; also Rymer's *Fœdera*. In May, 1602, a company calling themselves the King's players visited Ipswich. Possibly this was the company which visited Scotland in 1601, under Laurence Fletcher, to which James seems to have shown favour (cf. below, 183).

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] Cf. ii. 285 f.

[5] Cf. above, 101-103.

[6] *Ibid.*, 104 *n.*

[7] *Ibid.*, 53-54.

[8] Cf. ii. 30-31.

keepers at the Globe,[1] had ceased to act, or his name would have appeared in the 1603 list. Duke, Beeston, and Pallant had left the company for Worcester's men, probably about August, 1602.[2]

Immediately after receiving this licence the King's men no doubt left London for the provinces. During April, 1603, the plague was severe in the out-parishes of London, and various precautions were taken against its spread. On May 19 the number of plague deaths in the city and liberties for the preceding week had reached 22, and during the following week 30 such deaths were recorded. Consequently, after May 26, all playing-places in the city and liberties of London were closed, and the players forced to travel.[3] Appearances of the King's men are recorded at Richmond, Bath, Coventry, Shrewsbury, Mortlake, and Wilton House during 1603.[4] The last of these performances is particularly interesting. In November the King's company were at Mortlake, probably awaiting the decrease of the plague so that they might reopen the Globe, when they were summoned to play before the Court at Wilton House, where it had been installed since the third week in October.[5] The company accordingly journeyed to Wilton House and performed before the King on December 2, for which performance, and to defray their travelling expenses, the

[1] Cf. Pope's will (Collier, iii. 361).

[2] Cf. above, 54.

[3] Cf. ii. 185. Mr. Fleay who thinks that the theatres were not closed till June 9, when the weekly number of plague-deaths passed forty (*Drama*, i. 371 ; *Stage*, 162), is apparently followed by Mr. S. Lee in this opinion (*Life*, 239).

[4] Lee, *Life*, 41, and below, 183.

[5] *Cal. State Papers, Dom. Series*, 1603-10, 47-59.

King gave them a reward of £30.[1] Soon after James removed to Hampton Court, where on Dec. 26, 27, 28, Jan. 1, and Feb. 2 and 18, the King's men acted before him.[2] On Feb. 8, 1604, James gave Richard Burbage £30, 'for the mayntenance and reliefe of himselfe and the reste of his Companye beinge prohibited to present anie playes publiquelie in or neere London by reason of greate perill that might growe through the extraordinarie concourse and assemblie of people to a newe increase of the plague till it shall please God to settle the Cyttie in a more perfect health.'[3]

By March 15, 1604, it was considered safe for James to make his formal entry into London. In the triumphal procession which passed from the Tower to Westminster, walked the nine leading actors in the King's company as members of the royal household, each of them having received four and a half yards of red cloth to wear on the occasion. The actors named were the same nine shareholders mentioned in the patent of May 17, 1603.[4] Not till

[1] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxiv. Lee, *Life*, 240 *n*. There is no evidence to show that the play performed on this occasion was Shakespeare's *As You Like It*.

[2] Jonson's *Sejanus*, which was acted by the King's men in 1603, was probably first produced at one of these performances before the King, and consequently there is no necessity to suppose, as Fleay does, that the theatres had reopened when the play was produced (*Stage*, 189; *Drama*, i. 371). Neither is there any evidence to show that the King's men got into trouble over *Sejanus* in 1603. The charges of popery and treason brought against the play and its author in 1605 by Northampton seem to have been directed solely against Jonson, and not to have affected the King's men (*Conversations*, Drummond, 13).

[3] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxv.

[4] New Shak. Soc. Pub., 1877-79, App. ii. For this list, as for all others of this company, cf. opp. 172. The players wore red, and not the more expensive scarlet cloth as Mr. Lee states (*Life*, 240).

about April 9, however, were the London theatres reopened,[1] for on that day the Privy Council sent a letter to the Lord Mayor and Justices of Middlesex and Surrey, requiring them to permit 'the three Companies of Plaiers to the King, Queene and Prince publicklie to exercise ther Plaies in ther several and vsuall howses for that purpose and noe other, vz.: The Globe scituate in Maiden Lane on the Banckside in the Cowntie of Surrey, the Fortune in Goldinge Lane, and the Curtaine in Hollywelle in the Cowntie of Midlesex' . . . 'except ther shall happen weeklie to die of the Plague above the number of thirtie.'[2]

In August, 1604, the King's company was ordered to be in attendance at Somerset House to help entertain, if so desired, Juan Fernandez de Velasco,

[1] Mr. Fleay considers that the theatres were reopened about Dec. 22, 1603 (*Drama*, i. 371). His evidence for this is his statement that by Dec. 22 the plague-deaths in London had fallen below forty per week (*Stage*, 162). But, in the first place, the plague-deaths per week would have had to fall below thirty before the theatres could be reopened (cf. ii. 174 f.), and in the second place the mortality-tables for 1603 only state that during the week ending Dec. 22 there were seventy-four plague-deaths in the city, liberties and out-parishes, the number of deaths in the city and liberties and in the out-parishes not being separated. From Dec. 22, 1603, to Dec. 26, 1604, there are no extant mortality-tables, though it is well known that during 1604 London was comparatively free from the plague (cf. ii. 185).

[2] *Dulwich Catalogue*, G. F. Warner, 26. The letter in the Dulwich collection is a contemporary copy, the original being signed by the Earls of Nottingham, Suffolk, Shrewsbury, and Worcester, Sir W. Knowles, and Sir J. Stanhoppe. The Dulwich copy was printed by Collier in his *Memoirs of Edward Alleyn* (66) and another copy by Halliwell-Phillipps in his *Illustrations* (115). Collier also prints as genuine a forged list of the King's company written on the bottom edge of the sheet containing the above letter (cf. Malone, *Enquiry, etc.*, 215; Hamilton, *Enquiry, etc.*, 95; Ingleby, *Shakspere Controversy*, 269, fac. ii. sheet xvi.). Fleay dates this letter April 4, 1604 (*Stage*, 206), quoting it incorrectly from Malone (*Enquiry* 215).

the Spanish Ambassador extraordinary. Though no record of a performance by them during the two weeks of the Ambassador's stay at Somerset House has been preserved, there can be little doubt that they took part in the elaborate festivities of that time.[1]

During the winter of 1604 the King's men came into some disfavour at Court for acting a play dealing with the recent Gowry conspiracy. John Chamberlain, writing to Sir R. Winwood on Dec. 18, says, 'The tragedy of Gowry, with all actions and actors, hath been twice represented by the King's players, with exceeding concourse of all sorts of people; but whether the matter or manner be not well handled, or that it be thought unfit that Princes should be played on the stage in their life-time, I hear that some great counsellors are much displeased with it, and so it is thought it shall be forbidden.'[2] As this play has been lost, it is impossible to judge how deeply it would offend. However, as nothing more is heard of the matter, and during the Christmas festivities of 1604-5 the King's company often acted at Court, the offence could not have been very serious.

During the autumn of 1605 the King's company made a short provincial tour, appearing at Oxford and Barnstaple. They had certainly returned to London by the beginning of the Christmas festivities of 1605-6, for by March 24, 1606, they had performed ten plays before the Court.[3] By July 10, 1606, the

[1] Halliwell-Phillipps, *Outlines*, i. 212-213; Lee, *Life*, 241 *n.* 3.

[2] Quoted, Collier, i. 344.

[3] Mr. Fleay, on the evidence of some lines in *Mucedorus* referring to the trouble brought upon the theatre by a play full of political allusions conjectures that the play was *Volpone*, and that the King's company got

plague deaths exceeded thirty a week, and the company was forced to leave London.[1] Records of their visits to Marlborough, Oxford, Leicester, Saffron-Walden, Dover, and Maidstone have been preserved. They probably returned to London about Christmas, for from Dec. 26 to Feb. 27, 1607, they performed nine plays at Court. As the weekly death-rate from the plague did not fall below thirty, except for a week or two in November and December, till Jan. 8, 1607, it is unlikely that the London theatres were opened till after that date. Though on five occasions the weekly death-rate from the plague reached thirty between Jan. 8 and July 9, 1607, it seems probable that the theatres remained open. From July 9 to Nov. 19, however, the plague was more severe and the players were forced to travel. The King's company is heard of at Barnstaple, Oxford, and, if Jonson's dedication of the 1607 edition of *Volpone* refers to 1607, at Cambridge.[2] From Nov. 19, 1607, to July 28, 1608, London was comparatively free from the plague, and the London theatres no doubt remained open. During December, January, and February the King's men performed frequently at Court. On July 28, 1608, the weekly death-rate from the plague suddenly leapt to fifty, and in consequence the theatres were closed. They were, probably, not reopened till December, 1609, when the plague had much abated. During the autumn of 1608 the King's men visited Marlborough and Coventry. The Christmas and Shrove-tide

into trouble over its production. The evidence, however, is too vague to justify these conclusions (cf. *Drama*, i. 348; ii. 50, 51; *Stage*, 190).

[1] Cf. ii. 186.

[2] *Drama*, i. 373.

festivities found them again at Court, for on April 5, 1609, they were paid for twelve plays performed before the King. In May they played at Ipswich, Hythe, and New Romney. As there are no further records of them in the provinces during the year, there can be little doubt that the fear of infection in all parts of the country made it impossible for them to gain permission to act. There are no notices of any performances at Court during the winter 1609-10.

That the rivalry between the leading London companies was very keen during these years is evident from Dekker's statements in his *Raven's Almanac* (S.R. July, 1608; pr. 1609). He says, 'Another civil war do I find will fall between players, which, albeit at the beginning of this fatal year they salute one another like sworn brothers, yet before the middle of it, shall they wish one another's throat cut for two pence. The contention of the two houses (the Gods be thanked) was appeased long ago, but a deadly war between these three houses will, I fear, burst out like thunder and lightning. For it is thought, that flag will be advanced, as it were in martial defiance, against flag: numbers of people will also be mustered and fall to one side or other: the drums and trumpets must be sounded; parts will then, even by the chiefest players, be taken; words will pass to and fro, speeches cannot be so put up, hands will walk, and alarum be given: Fortune must favour them, else they are never able to stand.'[1] These statements undoubtedly refer to the expected opening of the Globe by the King's,

[1] Collier, i. 360.

the Curtain by the Queen's, and the Fortune by the Prince's men, in the autumn of 1609.[1]

Meanwhile, in August, 1608, the Burbadges took over the remaining lease of the Blackfriars theatre from Evans,[2] who had first 'set up' the Children of the Queen's Revels, or as they were at this time called the Children of the Chapel.[3] When the theatres, which were closed on account of the plague, were reopened in December, 1609, the Burbadges continued the Children of the Queen's Revels in Blackfriars for a short time. This is clear, because these children acted Fletcher's *Scornful Lady* at Blackfriars; a performance which must have taken place after March, 1609, the date of the beginning of the troubles in Cleves which are referred to in the play,[4] and before Jan. 4, 1610, when the reconstructed

[1] Cf. below, 207, 209.

[2] *Stage*, 235; cf. also 218, 221-222, 225 (the Greenstreet documents).

[3] *Outlines*, i. 317; below, 357.

[4] The passages read as follows:—(1) 'Foote, this is stranger than an Affrick monster, there will be no more talke of the Cleave wars whilst this lasts, come, Ile put the into blood' (v. 3). (2) 'To bed againe if you please, else I am fixt heere, till there be notice taken what I am, and what I have done: If you could juggle me into my woman-hood againe, & so cog me out of your company, all this would be forsworne, and I againe an afinego as your sister left me. No, Ile have it knowne and publisht; then if you'le be a whore, forsake me, & be sham'd: and when you can hold out no longer, marry some cast Cleve Captaine and sell Bottle-ale' (v. 3).

Mr. Thorndike objects to dating the *Scornful Lady* in 1609, that the above passages could hardly have been written so early as 1609, because the English troops employed in the Cleves wars saw no actual fighting till 1610, and the 'cast Cleve Captain' must refer to one of the English soldiers (A. H. Thorndike, *The Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakspere*, 86). But, granted that the 'cast Cleve Captain' would most likely refer to one of the English soldiers, there is nothing in these passages to necessitate dating them after July, 1610, when the English troops first saw fighting in the Cleves wars. As early as the spring of 1609 James I. had promised to send an English force to aid the Protestant party. No doubt this was well known in London, and would be quite enough to account for

Children of the Queen's Revels began their occupancy of the Whitefriars theatre.[1] The removal of the Queen's Revels to Whitefriars was no doubt caused by the occupation of Blackfriars by the King's men.[2] From this time till 1642 the King's men continued to use both the Globe and Blackfriars theatres, and it was, in all probability, while these changes of January, 1610, were in progress, that Underwood, Field, and Ostler were taken from the Queen's Revels into the King's company.[3] Field, however, if the mention of his name among those transferred from the Queen's Revels to the King's company at this time be not a mistake on Burbage's part, must have returned almost immediately to the Queen's Revels, probably as their manager, for in the list of that

the references to the Cleves wars in the above passages. Mr. Thorndike also objects to Mr. Fleay's suggestion that the words, 'I'll hear no more of this Apocrypha; bind it by itself' (i. 2), may refer to the Douay or the Authorised Versions of the Bible, 'both of which were in progress and under discussion in 1609, and completed in 1610' (*Drama*, i. 181). Mr. Thorndike says, 'The Apocrypha was generally separated from the rest of the bible in English bibles, and the passage has only a general significance.' But surely the passage would have much more point if written during the discussion and accomplishment of a new translation of the Bible! Mr. Thorndike's final objection, that the 1616 quarto of the *Scornful Lady* may refer to a production at the new Blackfriars in 1615-17 may be dismissed, as he himself acknowledges that all the evidence points to a date 'at least as early as 1610-11' (p. 87).

[1] Collier, i. 359, 381; below, 357.

[2] *Outlines*, i. 317.

[3] *Ibid.* Mr. Fleay conjectures that Dec. 25, 1609, was the exact date of these transactions. His only evidence for the opinion seems to be that Dec. 25 was a Quarter Day (*Stage*, 190). Mr. Fleay also states positively that Egglestone, who first appears as a King's man in the *Alchemist* list, 1610, joined the company in 1609-10 from the Queen's Revels (*Stage*, 190). As there is nothing to show that Egglestone was a Queen's Revels man before 1610, his being drafted from that company to the King's men in 1609-10, can be nothing more than a plausible conjecture.

company prefixed to Jonson's *Epicoene*, acted at Whitefriars between Jan. 4, 1610, and March 25, 1610 (*i.e.* 'in 1609,' must mean the regnal year, March 2, 1609, to March 25, 1610),[1] his name appears in the first place.

In 1610 the London theatres no doubt remained open till July 12, when the weekly death-rate from the plague rose above 40, seemingly the prohibitive number after *c.* 1608 or 9.[2] They probably did not reopen till *c.* December 6, for though the plague deaths fell to 22 for the week ending Nov. 15, they rose to 42 by Nov. 22, and were 39 on Nov. 29; after Dec. 6, however, the pestilence abated rapidly.[3] While the theatres were closed the King's men travelled in the provinces, where records of their visits are found at Dover, Oxford, and Shrewsbury. During the Christmas festivities of 1610-11, they frequently acted at Court. Though the plague does not seem to have been again severe in London till 1625, the King's company made a provincial tour almost every year from 1610 to *c.* 1622, when a regular provincial King's company was probably formed under the management of Richard Errington.[4]

On June 29, 1613, during a performance of *All is True*, a play dealing with the reign of Henry VIII., the Globe was burned down in less than two hours. All the actors and spectators escaped except one man who 'had his breeches set on fire, that would perhaps have broyled him, if he had not by the benefit of a provident wit put it out with bottle[d] ale.'

[1] *Stage*, 185; *Drama*, i. 374.
[2] Cf. ii. 174-175.
[3] *Ibid.*, 187.
[4] *Ibid.*, 6 f.

All the plays, costumes, etc., were saved. The cause of the fire was a piece of lighted wadding or paper from one of the cannons, which fell on the thatched roof of the theatre and set it ablaze. In the spring of 1614 the Globe was rebuilt, 'in far fairer manner than before,' and with a tiled roof.[1] During the rebuilding of the Globe the King's men no doubt used Blackfriars theatre for all their London performances.

During Lent, 1616, all plays were prohibited in London. Nevertheless, several of the companies, among them the King's, defied this order and played. As a result of this conduct, representative actors from these companies, John Hemings and Richard Burbage being chosen from the King's men, were summoned to appear before the Privy Council on the following Friday at 8 A.M. to account for their conduct. Meanwhile they and their fellows were commanded not to play 'at theire perills.'[2] As nothing more is heard of the matter, it seems probable that the players were let off with a reprimand.

On January 21, 1619, Lord Mayor Harvey issued

[1] Collier, i. 371; iii. 110-114; *Outlines*, i. 310-311. Till the opening of the Hope about the beginning of 1614 the Globe seems to have been for some time the only theatre open on the Bankside. (Cf. John Taylor's *The True Cause of the Waterman's Suit concerning Players, etc.*; *Stage*, 308; Collier, i. 374.)

[2] Collier, i. 380; *Stage*, 309. The next year, on June 22, the Privy Council wrote to Sir George Buc, Master of the Revels, forbidding the performance of an 'enterlude concerning the late Marquesse d'Ancre,' which was being prepared by some company unknown (Collier, i. 391-392). The Marquis d'Ancre was killed in Paris in April, 1617. If, as Fleay has conjectured, this play was the original *Thierry and Theodoret* of Fletcher and Massinger, the company involved was probably the King's men (*Stage*, 309-310; *Drama*, i. 205. For criticism of this theory, cf. Thorndike, *Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakspere*, 75 f., and E. E. Stoll, *John Webster*, 29 *n.*)

an order for the suppression of Blackfriars theatre. The reasons given for this order were that as early as 1596 the inhabitants of Blackfriars precinct had complained against the theatre, that in 1600 the Privy Council had limited London to two theatres, one on the Bankside and one near Golden Lane, thus prohibiting Blackfriars, that though called a private house the Blackfriars theatre was really a public playhouse, and finally, that in consequence of the number of people who crowded to the theatre, both on foot and in carriages, the streets in the district were almost impassable.[1] Against this order the King's men no doubt petitioned, for on March 27 they obtained a Privy Seal in which the King licensed his 'welbeloved servants, etc.,' to act not only at 'their now usuall Houses called the Globe within our Countie of Surrey, and their private House scituate in the precincts of Blackfriers within our Citty of London,' but 'also within any Towne Halls, or Moute-halls, or other convenient places within the liberties and freedom of any other Cittie, Universitie, Towne, or Burrough whatsoever within our said Realmes and Domynions.'[2] This Privy Seal contains a list of those actors who were shareholders in the company.[3]

Among the papers of the Earl de la Warr, at Knole Park, Kent, are two orders for delivery 'to the bearer John Hemminges, on behalf of himself and the rest of his fellowes, His Majesty's servants,

[1] *Outlines*, i. 311. There is no evidence in this document to show that the main point raised by Harvey's order against Blackfriars theatre was the distinction between private and public playhouses, as Mr. Fleay tries to make out (*Stage*, 266).

[2] Collier, i. 400.

[3] Cf. below, opp. 172.

. . . such allowance for their liveries as hath been heretofore accustomed.' These orders are dated respectively May 19, 1619, and April 7, 1621, are signed by the Earl of Pembroke, and contain lists of those actors who were shareholders in the company.[1]

On August 14, 1619, the play of *Sir John van Olden Barnaveldt*, by Fletcher and, probably, Massinger,[2] was ready for production by the King's men, but the players ' at th' instant were prohibited by my Lo. of London.' This prohibition was soon withdrawn, for by Aug. 27 the play had been produced. Though it had ' many spectators and receaued applause,'[3] this play was not included in the Fletcher folios. The only plausible reason for its omission seems to be the possibility that the play might still give offence.[4] The MS. of the play contains the names of several of the actors and their parts.[5]

On June 3, 1623, Nicholas Tooley (*alias* Wilkinson) made his will. In this he mentions several of his fellow actors of the King's company.[6] In September of the same year Sir Henry Herbert speaks of ' the four companies ' for whom he licensed plays, no

[1] *Hist. MSS. Com.*, iv. 299. For these lists, cf. below, opp. 172.

[2] *Old Plays*, ed. A. H. Bullen, ii. 201-206 ; Fleay, *Drama*, i. 209.

[3] *Domestic State Papers*, James I., cx. 18, 37 ; first quoted by Mr. Sidney Lee in *Athenæum*, 1884, Jan. 19. Mr. Bullen and Mr. Lee state that the prohibition was by John King, Bishop of London. But, so far as is known, the Bishop of London never had the right to prohibit plays, and Fleay is no doubt correct in supposing that 'my Lo. of London' was the Lord Mayor (*Stage*, 266).

[4] Cf. *Stage*, 266.

[5] Cf. below, opp. 172.

[6] Collier, iii. 451-456 : for the members of the company mentioned in this will, cf. below, opp. 172.

doubt meaning that at the time there were four regularly authorised acting companies in London.[1]

In August, 1624, the King's men were in trouble on account of Middleton's *Game of Chess*. On Aug. 12 Secretary Conway wrote to the Privy Council directing them to call 'the poet that made the comedy,' and 'the comedians that acted it,' before them, because the Spanish Ambassador Conde de Gondomar had complained that in the play were represented, 'in a rude, and dishonourable fashion,' 'the persons of his Majesty the King of Spain, the Conde de Gondomar, the Bishop of Spalato, etc.' Conway reminded the Privy Council that it was against regulations for a company to represent 'any modern Christian King' on the stage.[2] In an old MS. copy of the play, it is stated that the play was performed nine days in succession, and that the company took more than £1500 at the doors.[3] According to this statement, then, the play must have been put on the boards *c.* Aug. 3, 1624. The £1500 is pretty surely an exaggeration.[4]

The players appeared before the Privy Council, and on August 21 a report was sent to the King, to the effect that the company had produced a copy of the play, duly allowed and signed by Sir Henry Herbert, Master of the Revels, and 'protested' they had not varied from the same; that the poet, Middleton, had 'shifted out of the way,' and that they had 'issued warrant for the apprehending of

[1] Malone by Boswell, iii. 224; *Stage*, 302, 311; Collier, i. 413.
[2] Collier, i. 428 f. [3] Chalmers, *Apology*, 500.
[4] Sir Fras. Nethersole wrote on Aug. 14, 1624, that the play was so popular that players gained '100l. a night' (*Cal. State Papers*, 1624).

him'; also, that they had reproved the company, forbidden them to act during His Majesty's pleasure, and bound them to appear when called for. They, further, sent the book to the King to be examined, and suggested that he question Sir Henry Herbert about the matter.

On August 27 Secretary Conway wrote to the Privy Council from Woodstock, desiring them to examine further into the matter, and to punish severely the guilty parties. He also stated that he was not willing that the fault of one person should ruin the company. On the same day the Earl of Pembroke wrote to Viscount Mandeville, President of the Council, that the King did not think further punishment of his comedians necessary, and asked their lordships to 'connive at any common play lycensed by authority, that they shall act as before,' but to see that the *Game of Chess* was no more acted, and that the company was bound in their bond of £300 not to act it. On August 30, Edward Middleton, the poet's son, was called before the Privy Council and indemnified, but 'enjoined to attend the board till he be discharged by order of their Lordships.'[1] Thus closed the *Game of Chess* episode.[2]

Before the end of the year the King's men were again in trouble, this time for acting *The Spanish Viceroy or the Honour of Women* without licence.

[1] *Shak. Soc. Papers*, ii. 106.

[2] The tradition preserved in a MS. note by a contemporary hand in Dyce's copy of *The Game of Chess*, recording that Middleton was 'committed to prison, where hee lay some Tyme, and at last gott oute upon this petition presented to King James' (then follows a rhyming petition) is not to be trusted, because it also states that the chief actors were imprisoned, and there is no evidence in the official documents that this was the case (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*).

On Dec. 20 they made humble submission to Herbert for their offence, and promised to act no more plays without his permission. On receipt of this apology, which was signed by the eleven leading members of the company, they were no doubt pardoned.[1]

On March 27, 1625, James I. died, and was succeeded by his son Charles. He was buried in Westminster Abbey on May 7, and fifteen of his players, gowned in black, marched in his funeral procession.[2] On June 24, his company passed under the patronage of the new King.

II

Soon after his accession, Charles I. took his father's players under his patronage. On June 24, 1625, they received their new licence, which authorised them to play 'when the infection of the Plague shall not weekely exceede the nomber of forty, by the Certificate of the Lord Mayor of London for the

[1] Malone by Boswell, iii. 209. The names of the players who signed this apology will be found below, opposite 172. Herbert was evidently getting impatient with the repeated irregularities of the King's men, for when entering this submission of theirs in his office-book, he notes :—'Tis entered here for a remembrance against their disorders.' Why the King's men should have been so disorderly is hard to explain. Most likely they were presuming on the King's favour to stage plays which would draw large audiences by dealing with popular religious and political questions.

[2] *New Shak. Soc. Trans.*, 1877-9, App. ii. For the names of these players, cf. below, opp. 172. There seems to be some doubt as to the exact date of the King's funeral. May 5 is given by S. R. Gardiner in the *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, xxix. 180. Chamberlain in his letter to Carleton on May 14 gives May 7 (Nichols, *Progresses*, iv. 1049). The documents of the Earl of Denbigh, Master of the King's wardrobe, give May 20 (*New Shak. Soc. Trans.*, 1877-9, App. ii. 17). Fleay states that the allowance for cloaks was made on March 27 (*Stage*, 268). There is no authority for this statement in the documents.

time being, as well within these two theire most usuall houses, called the Globe within our County of Surrey, and their private House scituate within the precinct of the Black Fryers within our Citty of London, as also within any Towne-halls, or Moutehalls, or other convenient places within the Liberties and Freedome of any other Citty, university, town, or Borough whatsoever within our said Realmes and Dominions.'[1] They were also licensed by the Master of the Revels for travelling purposes on July 1.[2] A list of the company is given in the June licence.[3] Among the players mentioned is William Rowley, who on May 7 marched in King James's funeral procession as a Prince's man.[4] This is the last mention of him in connection with any company. Henry Condell also appears in this list. Just what his connection with the company was at this time is uncertain. After 1619 he is not mentioned as acting in any of the plays given by the King's men, and before 1623 he appears to have given up his part of the Cardinal in the *Duchess of Malfi* to Richard Robinson. It seems probable, then, that he ceased acting about 1619, though still connected with the King's company as a housekeeper at the Globe and Blackfriars.[5] A. Smith, W. Penn, T. Hobbes, and possibly others of the old Prince Charles's company were, also, at this time transferred to the King's company.[6]

The plague deaths reached forty-five per week by

[1] Collier, i. 435-436.
[2] Chalmers, *Supplemental Apology*, 185 *n.*
[3] Cf. below, opp. 172.
[4] *Ibid.*, 237.
[5] Cf. ii. 154.
[6] Cf. below, 237.

May 12, 1625, and did not fall below forty till Nov. 24.[1] Consequently, from May 12 till Nov. 24 the theatres remained closed. Whether or not during this time the King's men availed themselves of the travelling privilege in their 1625 licence is doubtful. Probably not, for there are no records of them in the provinces during the year,[2] and the attitude of the provincial towns was extremely hostile to those fleeing from the London plague.[3] At any rate, by December the company seems to have been so impoverished by their enforced inactivity, that the King gave them a gift of £66, 13s. 8d., 'for the better furnishing them with apparel' for the Court performances they had been ordered to give during the Christmas festivities of 1625-6. This payment was made to Joseph Taylor.[4]

During December the theatres were probably re-opened.[5] On May 25, 1626, the Privy Council wrote to the Surrey Justices of the Peace: 'Whereas we are informed that on Thursday next divers loose and idle persons, some sailors and others, have appointed to meete at the Play-house called the Globe, to see a play (as is pretended), but their end is thereby to disguise some routous and riotous action, we have therefore thought fit to give you notice of

[1] Cf. ii. 187.

[2] Fleay says they acted at Skipton Castle (*Stage*, 322). But the three performances he no doubt refers to are dated 1624, and were probably given by the regular provincial King's company (cf. ii. 6-8).

[3] Cf. *The Runaway's Answer to a Book called a Rod for Runaways*, written Sept. 10, 1625. This tract bemoans the heavy fate of those who fled to the provinces to escape the London plague, and has some references to theatrical affairs in London. But there is no evidence that it was written by some players, as Fleay asserts (*Stage*, 329). It speaks of Condell as in retirement at Fulham.

[4] Collier, i. 439.

[5] Cf. below, 265.

the information which we have received concerning this their purpose. And do likewise hereby will and require you to take very careful and strict order, that no play be acted on that day ; and also to have that strength about you as you shall think sufficient for the suppressing of any insolencies, or other mutinous intentions that you shall perceive,' etc.[1] This projected riot was no doubt planned as a revenge for the punishments inflicted on various sailors and others who committed a great riot at the Fortune playhouse and threatened one at the Bear Garden, about May 16.[2]

On April 11, 1627, the King's men, through John Hemmings, paid Sir Henry Herbert £5 'to forbid the playing of Shakespeare's plays, to the Red Bull company.'[3]

A list of the King's players, which includes the names of some of the boys and men not found in the official lists of the company, is prefixed to Ford's *Lover's Melancholy*, produced Nov. 24, 1628.[4]

From a document in the Lord Chamberlain's office, dated May 6, 1629, it appears that the leading members of the King's company were granted a certain quantity of cloth every two years, no doubt for livery purposes.[5] After naming fourteen players, the document orders that to each of them be delivered 'the several allowance of foure yardes of bastard scarlet for a cloake, and a quarter of a yard

[1] Collier, i. 445, 446.

[2] J. C. Jeaffreson, *Middlesex County Records*, iii. 161-162.

[3] Malone by Boswell, iii. 229 ; cf. also below, 271.

[4] Collier, i. 450 ; *Drama*, i. 233; below, opp. 172.

[5] Fleay supposes this cloth was granted 'in commemoration of his father's funeral' (*Stage*, 322). An astonishing supposition !

of crimson velvet for the capes, it being the usual allowance graunted unto them by his majesty every second yeare, and due at Easter last past.' [1]

Another severe outbreak of the plague occurred in London during the summer and autumn of 1630. From July 8 to Oct. 21, the weekly death-rate from the plague was above forty in the city.[2] Consequently the theatres were closed during that period. The King's men do not seem to have travelled,[3] and were so impoverished by September 20, that the King then granted them £100 to help equip them for their performances before him at his 'next coming to Hampton Court.' [4]

In 1631 the inhabitants of Blackfriars again petitioned for the removal of the theatre in that district. The petition was presented to Laud, Bishop of London. The items of complaint are much the same as in former petitions, danger of fire, interference with traffic and business, disturbances and riots, the great crowds collected, and especially the throngs of coaches, etc.[5] Nothing seems to have come of this petition—which may have been renewed in the meanwhile—till the autumn of 1633, when

[1] Malone by Boswell, iii. 60 *n.*; below, opp. 172.

[2] Cf. ii. 188. On Oct. 29, 1630, Sir Thomas Roe wrote to the Queen of Bohemia: 'No plays these six months, and that makes our statesmen see the good of them. If our heads had been filled with the loves of Pyramus and Thisbe, or the various fortunes of Don Quixote, we should never have cared who had made peace or war, but on the stage. Now every fool is inquiring what the French do in Italy, & what they treat in Germany' (*Cal. State Papers*, 1630).

[3] Cf. Provincial List below, 184. The performance at Bristol between March and July, 1630, was almost certainly by the 2, Red Bull—2, King Charles company (cf. below, 276).

[4] Collier, i. 459.

[5] *Ibid.*, i. 455; *Cal. State Papers*, 1631.

the matter came up for consideration in the Privy Council.[1] On Oct. 9 a committee, consisting of the aldermen of the ward and two others, was appointed to set a value on the Blackfriars theatre property, with a view to the removal of the playhouse. On Nov. 20 this committee reported that the players at first demanded £16,000, and when the committee told them to set down the items of this valuation, they sometime afterwards presented an itemised account amounting to £21,990. The committee's valuation was as follows :—for the playhouse, leased by the company ' of Cutbert Burbidge and William Burbidge (who have the inheritance thereof) at the rent of 50*l.* per Ann.,' for 14 [2] years, £700 ; for four tenements adjoining the playhouse for which the company receive £75 per annum rent, and a ' void piece of ground to turn coaches in,' at £6 per annum for 14 years, £1134 ; for the interest of the house-keepers and actor-sharers, 16 in all, and the ' damage they all pretend they shall sustain by their remove,' at £66, 13s. 4d. each, £1066, 13s. 4d. (though the players demand £150 each or £2400 in all).

The committee's work seems to have been useless, however, for the only result of the petition was that orders were posted at St. Paul's, at the Conduit in Fleet Street, and at the gate of the Blackfriars, which pointed out that the passage to the playhouse was easy by water, as was also the approach on foot, and directed that no coaches should approach nearer the

[1] Collier, i. 476 f.

[2] The players seem to have deceived the committee as regards the length of their lease which, according to the 1635 Blackfriars papers, had only about seven years to run (cf. ii. 160).

theatre 'than the farther side of St. Paul's Churchyard on the one side, and Fleet Conduit on the other side,' and that these coaches should be sent away at once. On Nov. 29 the Lord Mayor was ordered to enforce these regulations. But at a meeting of the Privy Council on Dec. 29, the King being present, these regulations were practically rescinded, and permission was granted 'that as many coaches as may stand within the Blackfriars gate may enter and stand there, or return thither at the end of the play.'[1]

It is not unlikely that about 1634, scenery was used for the first time on the public stage in England, when the King's men acted Henry Killigrew's *Conspiracy* at Blackfriars.[2]

During 1636-7 London underwent a particularly severe visitation of the plague. By May 12, 1636, the weekly number of plague deaths had reached 41, it fell to 22 and 38 on May 19 and 26, but by June 2 had risen to 51 and remained above 40, with the exception of the week ending Feb. 23, 1637, till August 24, 1637.[3] On May 10 an order for the temporary 'suppression' of theatrical amusements was drawn up by the Privy Council, and on May 12 it was handed to Sir Henry Herbert, who com-

[1] Collier, i. 478-479. According to Mr. Garrard these regulations were 'kept very strictly for two or three weeks, but now [*i.e.* Jan. 9, 1634], I think, it is disordered again' (Malone by Boswell, iii. 151 *n.*).

[2] *Stage*, 346, 347; *Drama*, ii. 22, 23. Soon after Heywood's *Love's Mistress* seems to have been acted with scenery by the Queen's men at the Cockpit (*Drama*, i. 299). For a discussion of Collier's statements about the acting of the *Midsummer Night's Dream* by the King's men before Bishop Williams in 1631 (cf. ii. 148 f.).

[3] Herbert gives the number of plague deaths for the week ending May 12, 1636, as fifty-four (Malone by Boswell, iii. 239). These plague dates show the promptness with which the council took action about the closing of the theatres.

municated it to the four leading companies in the city.[1] On May 17 a 'Players Pass' was issued to the King's men. This permitted them to act in all provincial towns, in order that they might be prepared 'to attend his majestie, and be nigh about the court this summer progress, in readiness, when they shall be called upon to act before his majestie.' This pass names eight of the less important players and boys, and refers to 'ten more or thereabouts of their fellows.'[2] The reason for the omission of the names of the principal actors of the company was, no doubt, because few of these intended to play in the provinces. In August, 1636, this travelling company played at Coventry under the title of 'The King's players of Blackfriars.'[3]

By November the King's men had probably all assembled near London, though the plague was still very severe in the city,[4] for on Dec. 10, 1636, the King issued a Privy Seal from Hampton Court, stating that he had commanded his players 'to assemble their company and keepe themselves together neere our Court for our service,' and ordering that they be paid a weekly allowance of £20, beginning on Nov. 1, and continuing during the royal pleasure.[5]

On Feb. 23, 1637, the weekly plague bill reported only 38 deaths in London, and the King gave the players permission to play.[6] The next week, how-

[1] Malone by Boswell, iii. 239.
[2] *Ibid.*, 166; below, opp. 172.
[3] Provincial List, below, 184.
[4] The plague bills for Nov. 3, 10, 17, and 24 were 755, 635, 572, 408.
[5] Collier, ii. 12 *n.*
[6] Malone by Boswell, iii. 239. Herbert gives the plague bill for Feb. 23 as forty-four.

ever, the plague bill read 57, and the theatres were again closed, not to be opened till October 2.[1]

During the plague of 1637 the King's men, and 'the King's and Queen's young company' under Christopher Beeston, complained to the Lord Chamberlain, Philip Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, that some of their plays were 'stolen or gotten from them by indirect means,' and printed without their consent. A similar complaint had been made to the former Lord Chamberlain, William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, between 1617, when he was appointed to that position, and April 17, 1630, when his brother became Lord Chamberlain. William Herbert had ordered this surreptitious printing of plays to be stopped, but his order had been disregarded. In consequence of the second petition Philip Herbert wrote to the Company of Printers and Stationers on June 10, 1637, ordering that no plays be printed by them without the consent in writing of John Lowen and Joseph Taylor for the King's company, and of Christopher Beeston for the young company, or their successors in the management of these companies.[2]

From Oct. 2, 1637, when the theatres reopened, till the summer of 1640, London was comparatively

[1] Malone by Boswell, iii. 239.

[2] Collier, ii. 17-18 *n.* Mr. Fleay comments on this letter as follows: 'It was in the confusion of the plague years that the players' consequent poverty induced them to sell to dishonest printers copies of plays made for prompters' use or special Court performances, which, being thrown aside after their immediate purpose was fulfilled, were appropriated by needy actors and surreptitiously issued' (*Stage*, 364). The improbable part of this theory, which otherwise is plausible enough, is that the company should so carelessly 'throw aside' any copies of their plays, when the use that might be made of them was well known.

free from the plague. But on July 23, 1640, the weekly number of plague deaths reached 41, and did not fall below that figure till Oct. 29. For some reason the authorities did not show their usual promptness in closing the theatres, for it was not till Sept. 11, when the weekly plague bill read 105, that it was ordered 'that all players, both their Majesty's servants and others, as also the keepers of Parish Garden, be hereby required and commanded for six months to shut up their playhouses, etc.'[1] In spite of the six months' clause in this enactment the theatres were probably allowed to reopen about Nov. 1, for on Nov. 10 Shirley's *Imposture* was licensed for the King's men.[2]

During 1641 the plague bills were above 40 from July 15 to Dec. 2, and for at least a part of that time the theatres were undoubtedly closed. There is no evidence that the King's London company travelled during that period. On Sept. 2, 1642, all plays were stopped by order of Parliament on account of the Civil War.[3]

[1] Collier, ii. 34; *Cal. State Papers*, 1640. Fleay quite unjustly suspects the authenticity of this order (*Stage*, 365). If he had looked in the *Cal. State Papers* he would have found there a summary of the document, which only differs from Collier's transcript by omitting the 'six months' clause. There seems to be no reason for suspecting that this clause was a forgery on Collier's part, for other orders exist which command the closing of the theatres till some definite date (cf. *Remembrancia*, 350).

[2] Malone by Boswell, iii. 232.

[3] Collier, ii. 36. Immediately after his receipt of £2 for licensing the *Irish Rebellion*, on June 8, 1642, Sir Henry Herbert entered in his office-book: 'Here ended my allowance of plaies, for the war began in Aug. 1642' (Malone by Boswell, iii. 242).

Little is known of the King's men after 1642. Wright, in the following account of the leading London players after the outbreak of the war, gives several details about them: 'Most of 'em, except Lowin, Taylor and Pollard (who were superannuated) went into the king's army, and, like

good men and true, serv'd their old master, tho' in a different, yet more honourable capacity. Robinson was kill'd at the taking of a place, (I think Basing-house) by Harrison, he that was after hang'd at Charing-cross, who refused him quarter, and shot him in the head when he had laid down his arms; abusing scripture at the same time, in saying "Cursed is he that doth the work of the Lord negligently," Mohun was a captain (and after the wars were ended here, served in Flanders, where he received pay as a major). Hart was a lieutenant of horse under Sir Thomas Dallison, in Prince Rupert's regiment; Burt was cornet in the same troop, and Shatterel quarter-master; Allen of the Cock-pit was a major, and quarter-master-general at Oxford. I have not heard of one of these players of any note that sided with the other party, but only Swanston, and he profess'd himself a presbyterian, took up the trade of a jeweller and liv'd in Aldermanbury, within the territory of father Calamy: the rest either lost, or expos'd their lives for their king. When the wars were over, and the royalists totally subdu'd, most of 'em who were left alive gather'd to London, and for a subsistence endeavour'd to revive their old trade privately. They made up one company out of all the scatter'd members of several; and in the winter before the king's murder, 1648, they ventured to act some plays, with as much caution and privacy as could be, at the Cock-pit. They continued undisturbed for three or four days; but at last, as they were presenting the tragedy of the Bloody Brother (in which Lowin acted Aubrey; Taylor, Rollo; Pollard, the Cook; Burt, Latorch; and I think Hart, Otto) a party of foot soldiers beset the house, surpriz'd 'em about the middle of the play, and carried 'em away in their habits, not admitting them to shift, to Hatton-house, then a prison, where, having detain'd them some time, they plundered them of their clothes, and let 'em loose again. Afterwards, in Oliver's time, they used to act privately, three or four miles or more out of town, now here, now there, sometimes in noblemen's houses, in particular, Holland-house at Kensington, where the nobility and gentry who met (but in no great numbers) used to make a sum for them, each giving a broad piece, or the like. And Alexander Goffe, the woman-actor at Black-friars (who had made himself known to persons of quality) used to be the jackall, and give notice of time and place. At Christmas and Bartholomew fair, they used to bribe the officer who commanded the guard at Whitehall, and were thereupon connived at to act for a few days, at the Red Bull; but were sometimes, notwithstanding, disturb'd by soldiers. Some pick'd up a little money by publishing the copies of plays never before printed, but kept up in manuscript: for instance, in the year 1652, Beaumont and Fletcher's Wild-Goose-Chace was printed in folio, for the public use of all the ingenious, as the title-page says, and private benefit of John Lowin and Joseph Taylor, servants to his late majesty; and by them dedicated to the honoured few lovers of dramatic poesy: wherein they modestly intimate their wants, and that with sufficient cause; for whatever they were before the wars, they were after reduced to a necessitous condition. Lowin, in his latter days, kept an inn, the Three Pigeons, at

Brentford, where he died very old. . . . Taylor died at Richmond, and was there buried. Pollard, who lived single, and had a competent estate, retired to some relations he had in the country, and there ended his life. Perkins and Summer of the Cock-pit, kept house together at Clerkenwell, and were there buried. These all died some years before the restoration, etc.' (*Historia Histrionica*). To this account the following details may be added: William Trigg joined the King's army and became a captain (Collier, ii. 39); on Sept. 22, 1645, the King's players threw themselves 'on the mercy of Parliament,' and offered to take the covenant and enter the service of Parliament (Collier, ii. 40 *n.*); in 1647 a folio edition of Beaumont and Fletcher's plays was published by a company of players consisting of Lowin, Taylor, Robinson, Benfield, Swanston, Pollard, Hammerton, and Clark of the King's men, and William Allen and Theophilus Bird or Bourne, who had in 1642 belonged to either Queen Henrietta's men or Beeston's boys; in 1647 (? or possibly 1644) while *A King and no King*, a former King's men's play, was being acted at Salisbury Court, probably by the above company, the sheriffs of London interrupted the performance and took 'Tim Reade the Fool' (about 1642 pretty surely a Queen's man) into custody (Collier, ii. 37-40; *Stage*, 365). From 1648 (or 1649), when some company acted at the Red Bull, till 1656, when acting was revived under Davenant, there are no records of any plays in London (Collier, 47-48). There is no evidence that the play at the Red Bull was *Rollo*, as Fleay states in his *Stage* (p. 366. He contradicts this statement on p. 354).

| King's Men, 1603-1625. | 1st Folio Shakespeare, c. 1587-Nov. 8, 1623. | Licence, May 17, 1603. | 'Sejanus,' 1603. (1 Folio.) | Procession List, March 15, 1604. | 'The Malcontent,' 1604. | A. Phillips' Will, May 4, 1605. | 'Volpone,' 1605. (1 Folio.) | 'Alchemist,' 1610. (1 Folio.) | 'Catiline,' 1611. (1 Folio.) | 'Captain,' 1612 (F); 1611? (T). (2 Folio.) | 'Duchess of Malfi,' c. 1611. | 'Valentinian,' 1611-1614. (2 Folio.) | 'Bonduca,' 1613-1614. (2 Folio.) | 'Queen of Corinth,' c. 1617 (F); c. 1617 (T). (2 Folio.) | 'Loyal Subject,' Nov. 16, 1618 (F); 1618 (T). (2 Folio.) | 'Knight of Malta,' c. 1618 (F); c. 1619 (T). (2 Folio.) | 'Mad Lover,' 1618-19 (F); c. 1618 (T). (2 Folio.) | Patent, March 27, 1619. | Livery Allowance List, May 19, 1619. | 'Barnavelt,' Aug. 1619. | 'Humorous Lieutenant,' 1619 (F); c. 1619? (T). (2 Folio.) | 'Woman Pleased,' c. 1620 (F); c. 1620 (T). (2 Folio.) | 'Custom of the Country,' c. 1620 (F); c. 1619 (T). (2 Folio.) | 'Double Marriage,' c. 1620 (F); c. 1619 (T). (2 Folio.) | 'Little French Lawyer,' c. 1620 (F); c. 1620 (T). (2 Folio.) | 'False One,' c. 1620-21 (F); c. 1620 (T). (2 Folio.) | 'Laws of Candy,' c. 1621 (F); c. 1619 (T). (2 Folio.) | 'Island Princess,' c. 1621 (F); c. 1620 (T). (2 Folio.) | 'Pilgrim,' c. 1621 (F); c. 1621 (T). (2 Folio.) | Livery Allowance List, April 7, 1621. | 'Prophetess,' May 14, 1622 (F); 1622 (T). (2 Folio.) | 'Sea Voyage,' June 22, 1622 (F); 1622 (T). (2 Folio.) | 'Spanish Curate,' Oct. 24, 1622 (F); 1622 (T). (2 Folio.) | 'Duchess of Malfi,' (1619-23). | Tooley's Will, June 3, 1623. | 'Maid in the Mill,' Aug. 20, 1623 (F); 1632 (T). (2 Folio.) | 'Lover's Progress,' Dec. 6, 1623; 1623 (T). (2 Folio.) | 'Wife for a Month,' May 27, 1624 (F); 1624 (T). (2 Folio.) | Submission for playing 'Spanish Viceroy,' Dec. 20, 1624. | 'Love's Pilgrimage' (revival), c. 1624-25? | 'Chances' (revival), c. 1624-25? | At James's Funeral, March 7, 1625. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (1) | (2) | | (3) | | (4) | | | | (5) | (6) | (7) | (7) | | | | | (8) | (9) | (10) | | | | | | | | | (11) | | | | (6) | (12) | | | | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) |
| William Shakespeare, . | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | ..... | F. | ... | ... | ... | 1 | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Richard Burbadge, . | 2 | 3 | 1 | 5 | Malevole, . | E. | 1 | 1 | 1 | ... | Ferdinand, . | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| John Hemmings, . | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 | * | E. | 2 | 2 | 2 | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 1 | 1 | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | * | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 1 |
| Augustine Phillips, . | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | ..... | T. | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| William Kempe, . | 5 | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Thomas Pope, . | 6 | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| George Bryan, . | 7 | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | * | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| Henry Condell, . | 8 | 6 | 6 | 8 | ..... | F. | 3 | 5 | 4 | 3 | Cardinal, . | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 2 | ..... | 1 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | * | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 2 |
| William Sly, . | 9 | 7 | 5 | 6 | * | E. | 5 | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Richard Cowley, . | 10 | 9 | ... | 9 | ..... | F. | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| John Lowin, . | 11 | ... | 7 | ... | * | ... | 4 | 3 | 5 | ... | ..... | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 3 | Barnavelt, . | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | * | 1 | 2 | 3 | Bosola, . | ... | 3 | 2 | ... | 2 | ... | ... | 15 |
| Samuel Cross, . | 12 | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Alexander Cook, . | 13 | ... | 8 | .. | ..... | F. | 6 | 7 | 3 | 2 | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Samuel Gilburne, . | 14 | ... | ... | ... | ..... | A. | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Robert Armin, . | 15 | 8 | ... | 7 | ..... | F. | ... | 9 | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| William Ostler, . | 16 | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | 4 | 7 | 4 | Antonio, . | 2 | 2 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Nathan Field, . | 17 | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | 2 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 4 | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| John Underwood, . | 18 | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | 6 | 6 | ... | ..... | 4 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 5 | ... | 6 | 5 | ..... | 6 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | * | ... | 4 | ... | Delio, . | * | 5 | 4 | 4 | ... | ... | ... |
| Nicholas Tooley, . | 19 | ... | ... | ... | ..... | F. | ... | 8 | 8 | ... | ..... | ... | 7 | 6 | 6 | ... | ... | 5 | 6 | Barnavelt's wife, . | ... | 6 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 5 | ... | 3 | * | 4 | 5 | 5 | Madman, . | * | ... | ... | 5 | ... | ... | ... |
| William Ecclestone, . | 20 | ... | ... | .. | ..... | ... | ... | 10 | 10 | ... | ..... | ... | 5 | ... | 8 | ... | 4 | 10 | 9 | ..... | 4 | 4 | 4 | ... | 4 | ... | 3 | 5 | ... | * | ... | 3 | 2 | ..... | * | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Joseph Taylor, . | 21 | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | .. | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 12 | ..... | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | * | 2 | 1 | 1 | Ferdinand, . | * | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | ... | 10 |
| Robert Benfield, . | 22 | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 4 | 3 | 8 | 8 | Captain, . | 7 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 5 | ... | 4 | 5 | * | 3 | ... | ... | Antonio, . | ... | 4 | 3 | 2 | 9 | ... | 11 |
| Robert Gough, . | 23 | ... | ... | ... | ..... | W. | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 9 | 7 | Leidenberch, . | ... | ... | ... | 4 | ... | ... | ... | ... | * | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Richard Robinson, . | 24 | ... | .. | .. | ..... | ... | ... | ... | 9 | ... | ..... | ... | 8 | ... | ... | ... | ... | 11 | 11 | Boisise, Captain, . | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | * | ... | ... | ... | Cardinal, . | * | ... | ... | 3 | 3 | ... | 6 |
| John Shank, . | 25 | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 12 | 10 | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | * | 5 | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 4 | ... | 8 |
| John Rice, . | 26 | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | Captain, . | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 6 | ... | ... | * | ... | ... | ... | Pescara, . | ... | ... | ... | ... | 6 | ... | 12 |
| Laurence Fletcher, . | ... | 1 | ... | 3 | ..... | F. | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| John Sinkler, . | ... | ... | ... | ... | * | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| James Sands, . | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | A. | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Robert Pallant, . | .. | ... | . | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | .. | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | Doctor, Cariola, Court Officers, | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Thomas Pollard, . | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | 7 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | Bredero, Holderus, | 8 | ... | ... | ... | ... | 8 | 8 | ... | ... | ... | 4 | Silvio, . | ... | 6 | 5 | ... | 7 | ... | ... | 14 |
| Thomas Holcombe, . | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | 8 | ... | 8 | ... | ... | ... | Provost's wife, . | ... | 8 | 8 | ... | 8 | ... | ... | ... | 8 | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Richard Sharp, . | ... | .. | .. | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | 7 | 7 | 6 | ... | ... | ... | ..... | 5 | 7 | 6 | 8 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 | ... | ... | 7 | ... | 6 | Duchess, . | ... | ... | 6 | ... | 10 | ... | 5 |
| James Horn, . | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 8 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 13 |
| John Thompson, . | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 6 | ... | 7 | ... | ... | ... | ... | Julia, . | ... | 2 | 8 | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| George Birch, . | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | Vandort, . | ... | ... | ... | 7 | ... | 8 | ... | 6 | 6 | ... | 6 | ... | ..... | ... | ... | 7 | 6 | 11 | ... | .. | 4 |
| William Rowley, . | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | 7 | ... | ... | 8 | * | * | ... |
| Elliard Swanston, . | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 5 | ... | ... | 9 |
| Richard Perkins, . | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 3 |
| George Vernon, . | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 7 |
| John Bacon, . | ... | ... | ... | .. | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | * | ... | ... |
| G. Lowin, . | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | Barnavelt's daughter, . | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| — Ashton, . | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | * | ... | ... |
| Michael, . | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | Huntsman, Captain, . | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| R. T., . | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | Officer, Huntsman, . | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |

(1) Kemp, Pope, Bryan, and Cross do not appear in any list of this company after 1603.

(2) Collier, i. 334, 335, etc.; Rymer's *Fœdera*.

(3) N.S.S. Pub., 1877-9, App. ii.

(4) Collier, iii. 327-329. In this list, A. stands for apprentice, F. for fellow-actor, E. for executor, T. for testator, and W. for witness.

(5) In dating this and subsequent lists from Beaumont and Fletcher's 2nd Folio, 1679, F. stands for Fleay's *Stage* and *Drama*, and T. for Thorndike's *Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakspere*.

(6) For a full discussion of the *Duchess of Malfi* lists of *c.* 1611 and 1619-23, *cf.* ii. 146 f.

(7) Ostler died on Dec. 16, 1616, so *Valentinian* and *Bonduca* must have been performed before that date, *cf.* Dr. Wallace in the *Times*, Oct. 2 and 4, 1909; *Drama*, i. 203; Thorndike, 91. Ecclestone played with the Lady Elizabeth's men in 1613, *cf* below, 243.

(8) *Cal. State Papers*, 1619; Collier, i. 400.

(9) *Hist. MSS. Com.*, iv. 299. This list is from an order found among the papers of Earl de La Warr, Baron Buckhurst, at Knole Park, Kent. It is dated May 19, 1619, and is signed by the Earl of Pembroke. It orders 'deliverie to the bearer, John Hemmings, on behalf of himself and the rest of his fellowes, His Majestys servants, the players whose names are underwritten such allowance for their liveries as hath been heretofore accustomed.' This list is omitted by Mr. Fleay.

(10) *Old Plays*, ed. A. H. Bullen, vol. ii.; *Stage*, 268. Mr. Fleay omits Robinson.

(11) *Hist. MSS. Com.*, iv. 299. This list is not in Mr. Fleay. Like the similar list of 1619 it was found among the papers of Earl de la Warr, at Knole Park, Kent.

(12) Collier, iii. 452-456. Mr. Fleay does not mention Robinson in his copy of this list (*Stage*, 268). Tooley mentions Cuthbert Burbadge who was a housekeeper in the Globe and Blackfriars Theatres though not an actor.

(13) Malone by Boswell, iii. 209-210.

(14) These names are taken from the stage-directions in the 1st Folio of Beaumont and Fletcher (1647). As Rowley did not appear with the King's men before 1623 or after 1625, this revival probably took place between those dates. (*Stage*, 375; *Drama*, i. 193-194).

(15) Beaumont and Fletcher, 1st Folio, stage-directions (*Drama*, i. 200).

(16) New Shak. Soc. Pub., 1877-9, App. ii. Each of these players was granted four yards of cloth for a cloak to wear in King James's funeral procession.

| King's Men, 1625-1642. | 'Two Noble Kinsmen,' c. 1613 – 1634 (?) (original or revival ?). | Patent, June 24, 1625. | Massinger's 'Roman Actor.' Lic. October 11, 1626. | Ford's 'Lover's Melancholy.' Lic. Nov. 24, 1628. | Cloak Allowance, May 7, 1634. | Massinger's 'Picture.' Lic. June 8, 1629. | Carlell's 'Deserving Favorite.' Pub. 1629. | 'The Mad Lover,' c. 1630(?). (A revival.) | Massinger's 'Believe as You List.' Jan. 11, 1631. Lic. May 7, 1631. | Fletcher's 'Wildgoose Chase,' revival 1631. | Player's Pass, May 17, 1636. | 'Custom of the Country,' revival 1636-1642. | King's men's parts before 1642, from Wright's *Historia Histrionica*. | Beaumont and Fletcher Folio, 1647. | Robinson the Black Book, 1640. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (17) | (18) | (19) | | (21) | (22) | (23) | (24) | (25) | (32) | (33) | (34) | | | (37) |
| John Hemmings, | ... | 1 | ..... | ... | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Henry Condell, | ... | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| John Lowin, | ... | 3 | Domitianus Cæsar, | 1 | 2 | 2. Eubulus, an old Counsellor, | 3. Jacomo, | ... | Flaminius (III. 1 and p. 108), | 5. {Belleur, companion to both, of stout blunt humor, etc.} Most naturally acted, | | ... | {Falstaff in Shakespeare's 'Henry IV.' and 'Merry Wives of Windsor'; Morose, Volpone, and Mammon in Jonson's 'Epicene,' 'Volpone,' and 'Alchemist'; Melantius in Beaumont and Fletcher's 'Maid's Tragedy,'} | * | Aubrey |
| Joseph Taylor, | ... | 4 | Paris, the Tragœdian, | 2 | 3 | 4. Mathias, a knight of Bohemia, | 2. Duke, | ... | Antiochus (II. 2; and p. 108), | 3. {Mirabel, the Wild Goose, a travelled Monsieur, etc.} Incomparably acted, | ... | ... | Hamlet in Shakespeare's 'Hamlet,' | * | Rollo |
| Richard Robinson, | ... | 5 | Æsopus, a Player, | ... | 4 | ..... | 6. {Count Orsinio and Hermité,} | ... | Lentulus (III. 1; and p. 108), | 2. La Castre, indulgent Father, etc., | ... | ... | Comic parts, | * | |
| Robert Benfield, | ... | 6 | Junius Rusticus, | 3 | 6 | 1. Ladislaus, King of Hungary, | 1. King, | ... | Marcellus (V. 1; and p. 108), | 1. De Gard, a noble stayd gentleman, etc., | ... | ... | ..... | * | |
| John Shank, | ... | 7 | ..... | 4 | 5 | 7. Hilario, servant to Sophia, | ..... | | ..... | 11. {Petella, their waiting woman. Their servant,} | ... | ... | {Comic parts and Sir Roger in Beaumont and Fletcher's 'Scornful Lady.'} | | |
| William Rowley, | ... | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| John Rice, | ... | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Elliard Swanston, | ... | 10 | Aretinus Clemens, Cæsar's spy, | 5 | 8 | 6. Ricardo, a wild Courtier, | 5. {The Count Utrante,} | ... | Chrysalus (I. 1; and p. 108), | 7. Lugier, the rough and confident Tutor, etc., | ... | ... | Othello in Shakespeare's 'Othello,' | * | |
| George Birch, | ... | 11 | ..... | ... | | ..... | ..... | ... | ..... | ..... | ... | ... | ..... | ... | Latorch |
| Richard Sharp, | ... | 12 | Parthenius, a friend of Cæsar's, | 7 | 7 | 3. Ferdinand, Generall of the Army, | 4. Lysander. | | | | | | | | |
| Thomas Pollard, | ... | 13 | Aelius Lamia, Stephanos, | 8 | 9 | 5. Ubaldo, a wild Courtier, | ..... | ... | Berecynthus (I. 2; and p. 108), | 4. {Pinac, his fellow traveller, etc.} Admirably well acted | ... | ... | Comic parts, | * | Cook |
| Richard Perkins. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| George Vernon, | ... | ... | Sejeius, } 2 Lictors. (20), | {11 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| James Horn, | ... | ... | Entellus, } | {15 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Anthony Smith, | ... | ... | Philargus, a rich Miser, | 6 | 10 | ..... | 7. Gerard. | | | | | | | | |
| William Penn, | ... | ... | ..... | 9 | 12 | 8. Julio Baptista, a great Schollar, | ..... | ... | Merchant (V. 2); Jailor (IV. 2), | 6. Nantolet, Father, etc., | 1 | | | | |
| Curtis Greville, | * | ... | Latinus, a Player, | 10 | | ..... | ..... | ... | Merchant (IV. 3). (26.) | | | | | | |
| Richard Baxter, | ... | ... | ..... | 12 | | ..... | ..... | * | ..... | ..... | 5 | | | | |
| John Thompson, | ... | ... | Domitia, the wife of Aelius Lamia, | 13 | | 9. Honoria, the Queen, | 9. Cleonarda. | | | | | | | | |
| William Trigg, | ... | ... | Julia, Titus Daughter, | 14 | | 12. Corsica, Sophia's woman, | ..... | ... | ..... | 9. Rosalura Aërie, daughter, etc., | 3 | | | | |
| Alexander Gough, | ... | ... | Caenio, Vespatian's concubine, | 16 | | 10. Acanthe, a maid of honor, | ..... | ... | ..... | 10. Lillia-Bianca, daughter, etc., | 6 | | | | |
| Thomas Hobbes, | ... | ... | ..... | 17 | 11 | ..... | ..... | ... | Calistus (III. 1), | ..... | 2 | | | | |
| William Patrick, | ... | ... | Palphurius Sura, a Senator, | ... | | ..... | ..... | ... | Captain (V. 2). (27) | ..... | 4 | | | | |
| William Hart, | ... | ... | ..... | ... | | ..... | ..... | ... | ..... | ..... | 7 | ... | Duchess in Shirley's 'Cardinal.' (35), | ... | Otto |
| Richard Hawley, | ... | ... | ..... | ... | | ..... | ..... | ... | ..... | ..... | 8 | | | | |
| T. Tucke, | * | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| John Hunnyman, | ... | ... | Domitilla, cousin-germane to Cæsar, | ... | | 11. Sophia, wife to Mathias, | 8. Clarinda, | ... | Merchant (IV. 3), | 12. A young Factor. | | | | | |
| Edward Horton, | ... | ... | ..... | ... | | ..... | 10. Mariana. | * | | | | | | | |
| Stephen Hammerton, | ... | ... | ..... | ... | | ..... | ..... | ... | ..... | 8. Oriana, etc., | ... | ... | {Amyntor in Beaumont and Fletcher's 'Maid's Tragedy,'} | * | |
| —— Rowland, | ... | ... | ..... | ... | | ..... | ..... | ... | {Amilcar (II. 2); Prusias (III. 2); Servant (V. 2). (28.)} | | | | | | |
| Richard Baxter, | ... | ... | ..... | ... | | ..... | ..... | ... | {Titus (III. 1); Officer (IV. 3); Servant (V. 2). (29.)} | | | | | | |
| —— Balls, | ... | ... | ..... | ... | | ..... | ..... | ... | Queen (?) (III. 2). | | | | | | |
| Nick ——, | ... | ... | ..... | ... | | ..... | ..... | ... | {Cornelia (?) (V. 1); Asolrubal or Carlbalo (?) (II. 2); Philoxenes or lady (?) (III. 2).} | | | | | | |
| William Mago, | ... | ... | ..... | ... | | ..... | ..... | ... | Harmo or Asolrubal (?) (II. 2). (30.) | | | | | | |
| Gascoigne, Hubert, | ... | ... | ..... | ... | | ..... | ..... | ... | {Open the trap door for Antiochus (Taylor) (IV. 1). (31.)} | | | | | | |
| Harry Wilson and boy, | ... | ... | ..... | ... | | ..... | ..... | ... | Sing behind the arras (IV. 2.) | | | | | | |
| Hugh Clark, | ... | ... | ..... | ... | | ..... | ..... | ... | ..... | ..... | ... | Prologue, | ..... | * | |
| Jago, | ... | ... | ..... | ... | | ..... | ..... | ... | ..... | ..... | ... | ... | {Truewit and Face in Jonson's 'Epicene' and 'Alchemist.'} | | |
| Clun, | ... | ... | ..... | ... | | ..... | ..... | ... | ..... | ..... | ... | ... | Women's parts. | | |
| Burt, | ... | ... | ..... | ... | | ..... | ..... | ... | ..... | ..... | ... | ... | Women's parts before 1637 (?). (36.) | | |

(17) Quarto, 1634, stage directions, IV. 2; v. 3, *cf. Stage*, 270; *Drama*, i. 190; Thorndike, 44, etc.

(18) Collier, i. 435. Mr. Fleay omits Pollard (*Stage*, 323).

(19) Quarto of 1629 (British Museum).

(20) Act v. Sc. 2.

(21) Malone by Boswell, iii. 60, 61 *n.*

(22) Quarto of 1630 (British Museum).

(23) Quarto of 1629 (British Museum). Mr. Fleay reads 'Gerard' as 'guard,' and gives the part to George Vernon (*Stage*, 324).

(24) 1st Folio (1647). II. 1; IV. 1, stage directions; *cf. Drama*, i. 207.

(25) Percy Soc. Pub., Jan. 1849, No. lxxx.

(26) Omitted by Mr. Fleay (*Stage*, 324). 'Curt' of the MS. is surely Curtis Greville.

(27) Omitted by Mr. Fleay (*Stage*, 324). It appears as though Patrick may also have played Demetrius at some time (II. 1). Rowland and possibly Baxter may also occasionally have played this part (III. 1 and III. 3).

(28) *Cf.* above, *n.* 26. Mr Fleay considers 'Rowland' a first name (*Stage*, 324). But more likely it was a surname, as it is prefaced by Mr. in III. 1.

(29) Baxter's name, *i.e.* 'R. Box,' occurs in the margin of II. 1, opposite the entry of Flaminius and Calistus, but he could hardly have played either of these characters (*cf.* above).

(30) *Cf.* also IV. 2, where it is hard to make out what part Mago took: possibly Queen or Philoxenes.

(31) Mr. Fleay spells 'Hubert' 'Herbert' (*Stage*, ii. 1). On what evidence nowhere appears.

(32) Published 1652. On date *cf. Drama*, i. 215, 216. The comments on the parts are from the 1652 copy in the British Museum.

(33) Collier, ii. 10. This list is only a partial one. The Pass mentions that there were ten other players. Mr. Fleay conjectures most plausibly that among the ten were John Lowin, Joseph Taylor, Richard Robinson, Robert Benfield, Eliard Swanston, George Birch, and Thomas Pollard (*Stage*, 323; *cf.* also later lists).

(34) *Cf.* below, 262-263; *Drama*, i. 210.

(35) Hart was Robinson's boy (*Historia Histrionica*).

(36) According to Wright, Burt was Shank's boy at Blackfriars and afterwards under Beeston at the Cockpit. As Shank died in 1636 and Beeston's young company was formed in 1637, Burt, no doubt, joined the latter company in 1637 (*cf.* below, 367 f.).

(37) *Historia Histrionica*.

# COURT PERFORMANCES

## I

(Under the patronage of King James I., 1603, March 24–1625, March 27.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1603. Dec. 2, . . | | (The King's players).[1] |
| Dec. 26, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| Dec. 27, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| Dec. 28, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| Dec. 30, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| 1604. Jan. 1, . . . | | ( ,, ).[2] |
| Feb. 2, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| Feb. 18, . . . | | ( ,, ).[3] |
| Nov. 1, . . . | *Moor of Venice.* | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 4, . . . | *Merry Wives of Windsor.* | ( ,, ). |
| Dec. 26, . . . | *Measure for Measure.* | ( ,, ). |
| Dec. 28, . . . | *Comedy of Errors.* | ( ,, ). |
| 1605. Jan. 2–6, . . | *Love's Labour's Lost.* | ( ,, ). |
| Jan. 7, . . . | *Henry V.* | ( ,, ). |
| Jan. 8, . . . | *Every Man out of his Humour.* | ( ,, ). |
| Feb. 2, . . . | *Every Man in his Humour.* | ( ,, ). |
| Feb. 3, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| Feb. 10, . . . | *Merchant of Venice.* | ( ,, ). |
| Feb. 11, . . . | [*The Spanish Maz.*]. | ( ,, ). |
| Feb. 12, . . . | *Merchant of Venice.* | ( ,, ).[4] |
| 1605-6. *c.* Christmas, . | Ten plays, including *Mucedorus.* | ( ,, ).[5] |
| 1606. July-August, . . | | ( ,, ).[6] |
| Dec. 26, . . . | *Lear.* | ( ,, ). |
| Dec. 29, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| 1607. Jan. 4, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| Jan. 6, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| Jan. 8, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| Feb. 2, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| Feb. 5, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| Feb. 15, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| Feb. 27, . . . | | ( ,, ).[7] |
| Dec. 26, . . . | | ( ,, ). |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Dec. 27, . . . | | (The King's players). |
| Dec. 28, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| 1608. Jan. 2, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| Jan. 6, . . . | Two plays. | ( ,, ). |
| Jan. 7, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| Jan. 9, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| Jan. 17, . . . | Two plays. | ( ,, ). |
| Jan. 26, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| Feb. 2, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| Feb. 6, . . . | | ( ,, ).[8] |
| 1608-9. *c.* Christmas, . | Twelve plays. | ( ,, ).[9] |
| 1610-11, . . . . | Fifteen plays. | ( ,, ).[10] |
| 1611. Oct. 31, . . . | [*Tempest*]. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 1, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 5, . . . | [*Winter's Tale*]. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 9, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 19, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| Dec. 16, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| Dec. 26, . . . | [*A King and no King*]. | ( ,, ). |
| Dec. 31, . . . | [*Twins' Tragedy*]. | ( ,, ). |
| 1612. Jan. 5, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| Jan. 7, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| [Jan. 12, . . . | *Silver Age.* | (King's and Queen's players)]. |
| [Jan. 13, . . . | *Lucretia.* | (King's and Queen's players)]. |
| Jan. 15, . . . | | (The King's players). |
| Feb. 9, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| Feb. 19, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| Feb. 20, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| Feb. 20, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| Feb. 23, . . . | [*Nobleman*]. | ( ,, ). |
| Feb. 28, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| March 28, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| April 3, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| April 16, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| April 26, . . . | | ( ,, ).[11] |
| 1612-13, . . . . | Eight plays. | ( ,, ).[12] |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Fourteen plays, as follows: *Philaster* (by Beaumont and Fletcher); *The Knot of Fools; Much Ado about Nothing* (by Shakespeare); *The Maid's Tragedy* (by B. and F.); *The Merry Devil of Edmonton; The Tempest* (Sh.); *A King and no King* (B. and F.); *The Twins' Tragedy*; *The Winter's Tale* (Sh.); *Sir John Falstaff* [*Merry Wives of Windsor*, by Sh.]; *The Moor of Venice* (*Othello*, by Sh.); *The Nobleman* (Tourneur); *Cæsar's Tragedy* [*Julius Cæsar*, by Sh.]; *Love lies a bleeding* (*Philaster*, by Fletcher). | (The King's players).[13] |
| | Six plays, as follows: *A Bad Beginning makes a Good Ending; The Captain* (by B. and F.); *The Alchemist* (by Jonson); *Cardenna* [Fletcher and Shakespeare]; *Hotspur* [*I. Henry IV.*, by Sh.]; *Benedicite and Bettris* [*Much Ado about Nothing*, by Sh]. | ( ,, ).[14] |
| 1613. June 8, . . . | *Cardenna.* | ( ,, ).[15] |
| Nov. 4, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 16, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| 1614. Jan. 10, . . | | ( ,, ). |
| Feb. 4, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| Feb. 8, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| Feb. 10, . . . | | ( ,, ). |
| Feb. 18, . . . | | ( ,, ).[16] |
| 1613-14. Nov., Dec., Jan., Feb., March, . . | Nine plays. | ( ,, ).[17] |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1618. April 6, . . | *Twelfth Night.* | (The King's players). |
| April 7, . . . | *Winter's Tale.* | ( ,, ).[18] |
| May 3, . . . | *Merry Devil of Edmonton.* | ( ,, ).[19] |
| 1621. Nov. 5, . . . | *The Woman's Plot.* | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 26, . . . | *The Woman is too hard for him.* | ( ,, ). |
| 1621. Dec. 26, St. Stephen's [afternoon], . . | *The Island Princess.* | ( ,, ). |
| Dec. 26, St. Stephen's night, . . . | *The Spanish Curate.* | ( ,, ). |
| Dec. 27, St. John's night, | *The Beggar's Bush.* | ( ,, ). |
| Dec. 30, Sunday after Christmas, . . | *The Pilgrim.* | ( ,, ). |
| 1622. Jan. 1 [afternoon], . | *The Pilgrim.* | ( ,, ). |
| Jan. 1, at night, . . | *The Alchemist.* | ( ,, ). |
| Jan. 24, . . . | *The Wild Goose Chase.* | ( ,, ). |
| Feb. 2, Candlemas day, | *Malvolio* [*Twelfth Night*]. | ( ,, ). |
| March 5, . . . | *The Coxcomb.* | ( ,, ).[20] |
| 1623. Sept. 29, Michaelmas, | *The Maid of the Mill.* | ( ,, ) [21] |
| Nov. 1, All Hallows, . | *The Maid of the Mill* (reformed). | ( ,, ).[22] |
| Dec. 26, St. Stephen's day, . . . | *The Maid of the Mill.* | ( ,, ).[23] |
| Dec. 28, Innocents' day, | *The Buck is a Thief.* | ( ,, ).[24] |
| 1624. Jan. 1, . . . | *The Wandering Lovers.* | ( ,, ).[25] |
| Jan. 6, Twelfth Night, . | *More Dissemblers besides Women.* | ( ,, ).[26] |
| Jan. 18, . | *The Winter's Tale.* | ( ,, ).[27] |
| Nov. 2, . . . | *Rule a Wife and have a Wife.* | ( ,, ).[28] |
| Dec. 26, St. Stephen's Day, . . . | *Rule a Wife and have a Wife.* | ( ,, ).[29] |
| Dec. 27 St. John's Day, | *The Fox, by the* ——. | ( ,, ).[30] |
| 1625. Jan. 1, . . | *The First Part of Sir John Falstaff* (i.e. *I. Henry IV.*). | ( ,, ).[31] |

II

(Under the patronage of King Charles I., 1625, March 27—1649, Jan. 30.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1624. May 13–1626, May 30, . . . | Twenty plays. | (The King's players).[32] |
| 1633. Nov. 16, . . | *Richard III.* | ( ,, ).[33] |
| Nov. 26, . . . | *The Taming of the Shrew.* | ( ,, ).[34] |
| Nov. 28, . . . | *The Tamer Tamed (or The Woman's Prize).* | ( ,, ).[35] |
| Dec. 10, . . . | *The Loyal Subject.* | ( ,, ).[36] |
| 1634. Jan. 1, . . . | *Cymbeline.* | ( ,, ).[37] |
| Jan. 6, . . . | *The Faithful Shepherdess.* | ( ,, ).[38] |
| Jan. 12, . . . | *The Guardian.* | ( ,, ).[38] |
| Jan. 16, . . . | *The Winter's Tale.* | ( ,, ).[40] |
| Ap. 7, Easter Monday, . | *Bussy d'Ambois.* | ( ,, ).[41] |
| Ap. 8, Easter Tuesday, | *The Pastoral (Faithful Shepherdess).* | ( ,, ).[42] |
| 1633–Ap. 27, 1634, . . | Twenty-two plays. | ( ,, ).[43] |
| 1636. Feb. 16, . . | *I. Arviragus and Philicia.* | ( ,, ).[44] |
| Ap. 18, Easter Monday, | *II. Arviragus and Philicia.* | ( ,, ). |
| Ap. 19, Easter Tuesday, | *II. Arviragus and Philicia.* | ( ,, ).[45] |
| Dec. 26, . . . | *I. Arviragus and Philicia.* | ( ,, ).[46] |
| Dec. 27, . . . | *II. Arviragus and Philicia.* | ( ,, ).[47] |
| 1637. Jan. 1, . . . | *Love and Honour.* | ( ,, ).[48] |
| Jan. 5, . . . | *The Elder Brother.* | ( ,, ).[49] |
| 1637. Jan. 10, . . . | *A King and no King.* | ( ,, ).[50] |
| Jan. 12, . . . | *The Royal Slave.* | ( ,, ).[51] |
| Jan. 24, . . . | *Rollo.* | ( ,, ).[52] |
| Jan. 31, . . . | *Julius Cæsar.* | ( ,, ).[53] |
| Feb. 9, . . . | *A Wife for a Month.* | ( ,, ).[54] |
| Feb. 17, . . . | *The Governor.* | ( ,, ).[55] |
| Feb. 21, . . . | *Philaster.* | ( ,, ).[56] |
| 1637. Sept. 30–Feb. 3, '38. | Fourteen plays. | ( ,, ).[57] |
| 1638-[39], . . . | Twenty-four plays. | ( ,, ).[58] |
| 1639. Aug. 6–1640, Feb. 11, | Twenty-one plays. | ( ,, ).[59] |
| 1640. Nov. 10–1641, Feb. 22, | Several plays. | ( ,, ).[60] |
| 1642. Jan. 6, Twelfth Night, | *The Scornful Lady.* | ( ,, ).[61] |

NOTES TO COURT PERFORMANCES

[1] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxiv. On Dec. 3, 1603, John Hemings was paid £30 as a reward for a play presented before the King by the King's

men at Wilton, the seat of William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, where the Court was staying. The company had come to Wilton from Mortlake. There is no evidence that the play performed on this occasion was Shakespeare's *As You Like It* (cf. *Life of Shakespeare*, Sidney Lee, 1905, 240).

[2] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxv. On Jan. 18, 1604, John Hemings was paid for performances by the King's men before James I. on 'St Stephens daye at night, St Johns daye at night, Innocents daye and Newyeres daye at night,' and before Prince Henry on 'the xxxth of December and the firste of January.' For each play they received £6, 13s. 4d. (20 nobles), and in the case of the plays before the King they were given in addition a reward of £3, 6s. 8d. (5 marks) each; in all £53 (strictly £53, 6s. 8d., but not so Cunningham).

[3] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxvi. On Feb. 28, John Hemings was paid £13, 6s. 8d. and given a reward of £6, 13s. 4d. for two plays by the King's men before His Majesty 'on Candlemas day at night and Shrouesonday at night.'

[4] Cunningham, *Revels*, 203-205; xxxvi, xxxvii; *Outlines*, 1898, ii. 161-167; *Stage*, 177. The play names are from Cunningham's forged *Revels Book* for 1604-5, and Malone's notes (MS. Mal. 29, Bodleian). Cunningham's forgery was undoubtedly based on some authentic original, and the play names he gives are, with the exception of *The Spanish Maz.*, substantiated by Malone's notes. In addition to the plays mentioned above, Mr. Fleay credits the King's men with a performance of the *Queen's Mask of Moors* on Jan. 6, 1605 (*Stage*, 171). There is no evidence in either Cunningham or Malone to justify this conclusion. Mr. Fleay also doubts the performances of *The Moor of Venice*, Nov. 1, 1604, *Love's Labour's Lost*, Jan. 2-6, 1605, *Every Man out of his Humor*, Jan. 8, 1605, and *Every Man in his Humor*, Feb. 2, 1605, though these all appear in Malone's notes (*Stage*, 177; but cf. *Drama*, ii. 191; i. 359, 362, where he apparently accepts the above performances of *The Moor of Venice*, *Every Man out of his Humor*, and *Every Man in his Humor*). On Jan. 21, 1604, John Hemings was paid for six plays before the King by the King's players, 'viz. on all Saintes day at nighte, the Sonday at nighte followinge beinge the 4th of November 1604, St Stephens daie at nighte, Innocents day at nighte and on the viith and viiith daies of January.' For each play they received £6, 13s. 4d. and a reward of £3, 6s. 8d. On Feb. 24, 1604, John Hemings was also paid for four plays before the King 'on Candlemas daye at night, on Shrouesunday at night, Shrouemonday at night and Shrouetuesday at nighte 1604,' at the same rate. On April 28, 1605, John Hemings was paid £6, 13s. 4d. and given a reward of £3, 6s. 8d. for a play before the King on Feb. 3, 1605. This was probably the 'play provided and discharged' of Cunningham's document. This entry is not given in Malone's notes.

[5] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxviii; *Drama*, ii. 30; quarto 1606, *Mucedorus*. On March 24, 1606, John Hemings was paid for ten plays performed before the King by His Majesty's players 'in the tyme of Christmas laste.' For every play the company received £6, 13s. 4d. and a reward of £3, 6s. 8d.

[6] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxviii. On Oct. 18, 1606, John Hemings was paid £30 'for three playes before his Ma^tie and the kinge of Denmarke twoe of them at Grenewich and one at Hampton Courte.' Malone's conjecture that one of these plays was Shakespeare's *Macbeth* has little evidence to support it (cf. Malone by Boswell, ii. 418 ; Collier, i. 354 ; Fleay, *Life of Shakespeare*, 240 ; Ward, *Drama*, ii. 171).

[7] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxix. On March 30, 1607, John Hemings was paid £24, 10s. (or possibly £70 ?), for nine plays before the King on Dec. 26, 29, 1606 ; Jan. 4, 6, 8, and Feb. 2, 5, 15, 27, 1607. The play on Dec. 26 was Shakespeare's *Lear* (Ward, *Drama*, ii. 174). Among the other plays performed was Barnes's *The Devil's Charter* (*Stage*, 172 *n.* ; Ward, *Drama*, ii. 627).

[8] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxviii-ix. On Feb. 8, 1608, John Hemings was paid £130 for thirteen plays by the King's men before His Majesty at Whitehall, 'viz. on St Stephens night, St Johns night, Childermas night, the second of January, Twelfnight two plaies, the seaventh of January, the ninth of January, the xviith of January two plaies, the xxvith of January, Candlemas night, and Shrovesunday at night.'

[9] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxix. On April 5, 1609, John Hemings was paid £120 for twelve plays by the King's men 'before the King, Queene Prince and Duke of Yorke at severall tymes in Christmas 1608.'

[10] Cunningham, *Revels*, xl. On Feb. 12, 1611, John Hemings was paid £150 for fifteen plays by the King's men before the King, Queen, and Prince Henry.

[11] Cunningham, *Revels*, xl, xli, 210-211. The play names in this list and the performances on Jan. 12, 13, 1612, are found only in Cunningham's forged *Revels Book* for 1611-12. Like the forged *Revels Book* of 1604-5, this may be based on authentic originals (but cf. Fleay, *Stage*, 173-174, 178). If the entry for Jan. 12 is correct, Prince Henry saw two plays on that day, one by the Duke of York's men and the other by the King's and Queen's men (cf. Duke of York's players, Court List, below 439). Payments for the plays of 1611-12 were made as follows :—On June 1, 1612, to John Hemings for six plays before King James on Oct. 31, Nov. 1, 5, Dec. 26, Jan. 5, Feb. 23, at £6, 13s. 4d. and a reward of £3, 6s. 8d. for each play ; for twelve plays before Prince Henry and the Duke of York on Nov. 9, 19, Dec. 16, 31, Jan. 7, 15, Feb. 19, 20, 28, April 3, 16 (one date omitted), at £6, 13s. 4d. per play ; and for four plays, one before the Lady Elizabeth and the Duke of York on Feb. 9, one before Prince Henry on Feb. 20, and two before the Lady Elizabeth on March 28, and April 26 at £6, 13s. 4d. per play.

[12] Cunningham, *Revels*, xlii. On May 19, 1613, John Hemings was paid £80 (?) for eight plays before King James. Mr. Fleay, on evidence which does not appear, conjectures that one of these was Beaumont and Fletcher's *Captain* (*Stage*, 175).

[13] Cunningham, *Revels*, xliii ; Sh. Soc. Pub., ii. 124. On May 20, 1613, John Hemings was paid £94, 6s. 8d. (£93, 6s. 8d., *Revels*) for fourteen plays before the Lady Elizabeth and Prince Palatine (and Prince Henry, *Revels*).

[14] Cunningham, *Revels*, xliii ; Sh. Soc. Pub., ii. 125. On May 20, 1613

John Hemings was paid £40 and given a reward of £20 for six plays before King James. Oldys's note stating that the *Captain* was acted on May 20, 1613, undoubtedly confuses the date of payment for the play with the date of performance.

[15] Cunningham, *Revels*, xliii ; Sh. Soc. Pub., ii. 125. On July 9, 1613, John Hemings was paid £6, 8s. 4d. for a performance of *Cardenna* before the Duke of Savoy's Ambassador on June 8, 1613.

[16] Cunningham, *Revels* xliii. On June 21, 1614, John Hemings was paid £46, 13s. for seven plays before Prince Charles on Nov. 4, 16, 1613 ; Jan. 10, Feb. 4, 8, 10, and 18, 1614.

[17] Cunningham, *Revels*, xliii. On June 21, 1614, John Hemings was paid £90 for nine plays before King James in Nov., Dec., Jan., Feb., and March, 1613-14. On Jan. 5, 1614-15, John Chamberlain wrote to Sir Dudley Carlton concerning the plays at Court as follows :—'They have plays at Court every night, both holidays and working days, wherein they show great patience ; being for the most part such poor stuff that, instead of delight, they send the auditory away with discontent. Indeed our poets brains and inventions are grown very dry, in so much, that of five new plays there is not one that pleases ; and therefore they are driven to furbish over their old, which stand them in best stead and bring them most profit' (Nichols, *Progresses*, iii. 26).

[18] Cunningham, *Revels*, xlv. On April 20, 1618, John Hemings was paid £20 for two plays before King James, 'on Easter Monday Twelfe night the play soe called and on Easter Tuesday the Winter's Tale.'

[19] Cunningham, *Revels*, xlv. On May 15, 1618, John Hemings was paid £10 for a performance of *The Merry Devil of Edmonton* before the King on May 3, 1618.

[20] Cf. ii. 193 ; Malone by Boswell, iii. 146-147, 225-226. On March 27, 1622, John Hemings was paid for the plays of Nov. 5, 24, Dec. 26 [afternoon], 1621 ; Jan. 1 [afternoon], 24, and March 5, 1622. For play names cf. also King's men's lists, above, opp. 172. Several of these performances are not given by Fleay (*Stage*, 258).

[21] Malone by Boswell, iii. 227. At Hampton Court.

[22] Malone by Boswell, iii. 227. At 'St. James, the prince being there only.

[23] Malone by Boswell, iii. 227. At Whitehall, 'the king and prince being there.'

[24] Malone by Boswell, iii. 227. At Whitehall, 'the king and prince being there.' On a Sunday.

[25] Malone by Boswell, iii. 227. At Whitehall, 'the prince only being there.

[26] Malone by Boswell, iii. 227. At Whitehall, 'the prince only being there.' In the margin against this entry Sir Henry Herbert wrote 'The worst play that ere I saw.'

[27] Malone by Boswell, iii. 228. At Whitehall, 'to the Duchess of Richmond, in the king's absence.'

[28] Malone by Boswell, iii. 228. Presented by the Lord Chamberlain, 'for the ladys.'

[29] Malone by Boswell, iii. 228. At Whitehall, 'the prince only being there.'

[30] Malone by Boswell, iii. 228. At Whitehall '[the prince], and the duke of Brunswick being there.'

[31] Malone by Boswell, iii. 228. At Whitehall, 'the prince only being there.'

[32] Collier, ii. 5. On May 24, 1635, John Lowen 'and the rest of the King's players' were paid £250 for twenty plays acted between May 13, 1624, and May 30, 1626.

[33] Malone by Boswell, iii. 233-234. Herbert's entry is as follows: 'On Saterday the 17th of Novemb. being the Queens birth-day, Richarde the Thirde was acted by the K. players at St. James, wher the king and queene were present, it being the first play the queene sawe since her M^tys. delivery of the Duke of York, 1633.'

[34] Malone by Boswell, iii. 234. Herbert's entry reads: 'On tusday night at Saint James, the 26 of Novemb. 1633, was acted before the King and Queene, The Taminge of the Shrew. Likt.' This play belonged to the King's men.

[35] Malone by Boswell, iii. 234, 208 *seqq.* Herbert's entry reads: 'On thursday night at St. James, the 28 of Novemb. 1633, was acted before the King and Queene, The Tamar Tamd, made by Fletcher. Very well likt. This play had been suppressed by Herbert on Oct. 18. On Oct. 21 he returned it to the King's men 'purged,' and Oct. 24 Lowin and Swanston apologised for their 'ill manners' in the matter.

[36] Malone by Boswell, iii. 234. Herbert's entry reads: 'On tusday night at Whitehall the 10 of Decemb. 1633, was acted before the King and Queen, The Loyal Subject, made by Fletcher, and very well likt by the king.' This play belonged to the King's men (cf. King's players' lists, above, opp. 172).

[37] Malone by Boswell, iii. 234. Herbert's entry reads: 'On Wensday night the first of January, 1633, Cymbeline was acted at Court by the King's players. Well likte by the kinge.'

[38] Malone by Boswell, iii. 234-235. Herbert's entry reads:—'On Monday night the sixth of January and the Twelfe Night was presented at Denmark-house, before the King and Queene, Fletcher's pastorall called The Faithfull Shepheardesse, in the clothes the Queene had given Taylor the year before of her owne pastorall. The scenes were fitted to the pastorall, and made, by Mr. Inigo Jones, in the great chamber, 1633.' This play was repeated on April 8 (cf. below, *n.* 42).

[39] Malone by Boswell, iii. 235. On Sunday 'by the King's players, and well likte.'

[40] Malone by Boswell, iii. 236. 'On thursday night . . . by the K. players, and likt.'

[41] Malone by Boswell, 237. 'By the king's players . . . at the Cockpitt in court.'

[42] Malone by Boswell, 237. 'By the king's players . . . at the Cockpitt in Court.' (Cf. above, *n.* 38).

[43] *Apology*, 507. On April 27, 1634, John Lowin, Joseph Taylor, and Eliard Swanston received £220 'for themselves, and the rest of their

fellows, the King's players, for 22 plays by them acted before his Majesty within a whole year.'

[44] Malone by Boswell, iii. 237. This performance was received 'with great approbation of K. and Queene.' As this play was performed at Blackfriars it must have been a King's men's play.

[45] Malone by Boswell, 238. Acted at the Cockpit, Whitehall, 'before the Kinge, and Queene, the Prince, and Prince Elector.' On May 10, 1636, the King's men were paid £180 'for plays, acted in 1635-[36].' (*Apology*, 509.)

[46] Malone by Boswell, iii. 239. At Hampton Court on Monday afternoon, Dec. 26.

[47] Malone by Boswell, 238. At Hampton Court on Tuesday, Dec. 27.

[48] Malone by Boswell, iii. 239. At Hampton Court on 'New-years night, sonday.' This play was publicly acted at Blackfriars, and so was a King's men's play.

[49] Malone by Boswell, 239. At Hampton Court on 'thursday the 5 Janua.' This play was acted by the King's men at Blackfriars.

[50] Malone by Boswell, 239. At Hampton Court on 'tusday y^e^ 10 Janua.' This was a King's men's play.

[51] Malone by Boswell, iii. 239. Herbert's entry reads :—'The Royal Slave, on thursday the 12 of Janu.—Oxford play, written by Cartwright. The king gave him forty pounds.' Additional details about this performance are learned from the *Cal. State Papers*, 1636-7 :—'1637, April 11. Westminster, 55. Warrant to pay 154*l.*, being the charge of the alterations and additions made in the scene, apparel, and properties employed for setting forth the new play called The Royal Slave lately acted at Hampton Court, together with the charge of dancers and composers of music, the same to be paid as follows, viz. :—to Peter le Hue, property maker, 50*l.* ; to George Portman, painter, 50*l.*, and to Estienne Nan and Sebastian la Pierre for themselves and 12 dancers, 54*l.*' (Cf. also below, *n.* 56.)

[52] Malone by Boswell, iii. 239. This was a King's men's play.

[53] Malone by Boswell, iii. 239. At St. James's. A King's Men's play.

[54] Malone by Boswell, iii. 239. 'By the K. players, at St. James.'

[55] Malone by Boswell, iii. 239. 'By the K. players, at St. James.'

[56] Malone by Boswell, iii. 239. 'By the K. players, at St. James.' On March 15, 1637, the King's players were paid £240—'viz. £210 for 21 plays, acted by them at £10 a play :—And £30 more, for a new play called *The Royal Slave*.' (*Apology*, 509.)

[57] *Apology*, 510. On March 15, 1638, John Lowin, Joseph Taylor, and Eliard Swanston were paid £150 for 14 plays by the King's players 'between the 30th of September and the 3d of February following, 1637—One whereof was at Hampton-court, for which £20 is allowed ; the rest at the usual allowance of £10 a play.'

[58] *Apology*, 510-511. On March 12, 1639, John Lowin, Joseph Taylor, and Eliard Swanston (or any one of them) were paid £300 for 24 plays acted before the King by the King's players during 1638-[39]. Six of these were performed at Hampton Court and Richmond and were

paid for at the rate of £20 each, because the company was 'not only at the loss of their day at home, but at extraordinary charges, by travelling, and carriage of their goods'; and eighteen at Whitehall, which were paid for at the rate of £10 each.

[59] *Apology*, 511. On April 4, 1640, John Lowin, Joseph Taylor, and Eliard Swanston were paid £230 for twenty-one plays by the King's men 'before their Majesty's, whereof two at Richmond, for which they are allowed £20 a piece; and for the rest £10 a piece; all these being acted between the 6th of August 1639 and the 11th of Febry. following.'

[60] *Apology*, 511-512. On March 20, 1641, John Lowin, Joseph Taylor, and Eliard Swanston (or any one of them) were paid £160 'for plays acted before his Majesty, the Queen, and Prince' between Nov. 10, 1640, and Feb. 22, 1641.

[61] Malone by Boswell, iii. 241. Herbert's entry reads:—'On Twelfe Night, 1641 [*i.e.* '42], the prince had a play called The Scornful Lady, at the Cockpitt [*i.e.* in Whitehall] but the kinge and queene were not there; and it was the only play acted at courte in the whole Christmas.' The play was a King's men's play.

## PROVINCIAL VISITS

### I

[The company which visited Scotland in 1601 under Laurence Fletcher.]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1601-2. May 30, '02, . . | Ipswich. | (The King's players). |

### II

(The Strange-Chamberlain Co. was taken under the patronage of James I. in 1603.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1602-3, . . . . . | Shrewsbury. | (The King's players). |
| Dec. 20, '02–Nov. 27, '03, . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| 1603-4. [Oct. 13, '03]–Oct. 14, '04, . . . . | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| [Nov., '03]—Nov. 22, '04, . | Oxford. | ( ,, ). |
| Late Nov., '03, . . . | Mortlake. | ( ,, ). |
| 1604-5, . . . . . | Barnstaple. | ( ,, ). |
| Oct. 9, '05, . . . | Oxford. | ( ,, ). |
| 1605-6. [After Jan. 17 06],, . | Marlborough. | ( ,, ). |
| July, '06], . . . . | Oxford. | ( ,, ). |
| [August, '06, . . . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| Oct. 6, '05–Oct. 5, '06, . | Saffron-Walden. | ( ,, ). |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Sept. 16-24, '06, . . . | Dover. | (The King's players). |
| Nov. 7, '05–[Nov., '06], . | Maidstone. | ( ,, ). |
| 1606-7. [July 9–Nov. 26, '07], . | Barnstaple. | ( ,, ). |
| Sept. 7, '07, . . . | Oxford. | ( ,, ). |
| [*c.* Sept., '07, . . . | Cambridge. | ( ,, )]. |
| 1607-8, . . . . . | Marlborough. | ( ,, ). |
| Oct. 29, '08, . . . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| 1608-9. May 9, '09, . . | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |
| May 16, '09, . . . | Hythe. | ( ,, ). |
| May 17, '09, . . . | New Romney. | ( ,, ). |
| 1609-10. July 6–Aug. 4, '10, . | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| [August, 1610], . . . | Oxford. | ( ,, ). |
| | Shrewsbury. | ( ,, ). |
| 1610-11, . . . . | Shrewsbury. | ( ,, ). |
| 1611-12. April 21, '12, . . | New Romney. | ( ,, ). |
| | Winchester. | ( ,, ). |
| 1612-13. Sept. 8, '12–Sept. 8, '13, . . . . | Folkestone. | ( ,, ). |
| [Nov. 12, '12]–Nov. 9, '13, | Oxford. | ( ,, ). |
| | Shrewsbury. | ( ,, ). |
| 1613-14. Nov. 23, '13–Nov. 16, '14, . . . . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| 1617-18. June 4, '18, . . | Marlborough. | ( ,, ). |
| | Winchester. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 14, '18, . . . | Marlborough. | ( ,, ). |
| 1619, . . . . . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| 1619-20. Jan. 10, '20, . . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| 1620-21. Before Feb. 20, '21, . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| 1621-22. [*c.* April, 1622], . . | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| 1632, . . . . . | Worcester, | ( ,, ). [1] |
| [1634. March 27, . . . | Southampton. | ( ,, )]. [2] |
| 1635-6. August, '36, . . . | Coventry. | (The King's players of Blackfriars). |

[1] Cf. ii. 410. As the entry in the Worcester accounts speaks of two King's companies, one was undoubtedly the Red Bull-King's company, which was much in the provinces, the other the King's company of the Globe and Blackfriars.

[2] Cf. ii. 399, and Red Bull-King's provincial list, below, 277. As the Red Bull-King's company seems to have played in Norwich till about March 23, 1634, it is hardly likely that they moved so rapidly as to be in Southampton on March 27, so the entry of that date probably refers to the Globe and Blackfriars King's company.

## II

## 1, 2, 3, QUEEN ANNE—1, RED BULL-REVELS COMPANIES[1]

### I

Late in 1603 the Earl of Worcester's men passed under the patronage of Queen Anne.[2] The rough, undated draft of their authorization by King James states that their usual houses were the 'Curtayne and the Bores Head,' that playing was to recommence when the plague deaths fell below thirty a week, and gives the following list of the company :—

Thomas Greene.
Christopher Beeston.
Thomas Heywood.
Richard Perkins.
Robert Pallant.

[1] As it is impossible to distinguish Queen Anne's London and provincial companies in the provinces with sufficient clearness to make out a different provincial list for each company, I have thought it best to treat all the Queen Anne's companies in one place. For 2, Red Bull company, cf. below, 276.

[2] G. Dugdale, *Time Triumphant*, pr. 1604. Mr. Fleay supposes that the Earl of Worcester's men became Queen Anne's men in May, 1603 (*Stage*, 190). This is obviously wrong, because this company acted in the provinces during the summer of 1603 as the Earl of Worcester's men. As they acted at Court on Jan. 4, 1604, as the Queen's men, it was in all probability after their return to London in the autumn of 1603, to await the reopening of the theatres, that they entered the Queen's service.

John Duke.
Thomas Swinnerton.
James Holt.
Robert Beeston.
Robert Lee.[1]

On March 15, 1604, James I. made his formal entry into London. Among the players who marched in the triumphal procession were the following members of the Queen's company, wearing cloaks of red cloth :—

Christopher Beeston.
Robert Lee.
John Duke.
Robert Pallant.
Richard Perkins.
Thomas Heywood.
James Holt.
Thomas Swinnerton.
Thomas Greene.
Robert Beeston.[2]

When the London theatres reopened about April, 1604, the Queen's men occupied the Curtain.[3]

[1] Collier, i. 336. The authenticity of this document, which Mr. Fleay doubts (*Stage*, 191), is made sufficiently clear by the following entry in the *Calendars of State Papers* (Domestic Series, vol. 1623-5, Addenda, 530): 'Licence to Thos. Greene, Chris. Beeston, Thos. Heywood, and six others, servants to the Queen, to "exercise the art and faculty of playing comedies, tragedies, histories, interludes, morals, pastorals, stage plays, &c.," in their "usual houses called the Curtayne and the Bore's Head," in Middlesex or elsewhere, as they may think fit, as soon as the plague decreases to 30 per week in London.'

[2] New Shak. Soc. Pub., App. ii., 1877-9. This list, except for some changes of order, is identical with that given in the undated draft quoted by Collier.

[3] Cf. above, 149 ; below, 207 *n.*

II

Early in 1605 a second Queen's company was formed. On March 7 it obtained a licence which permitted it to appear 'about the Cittye of London, and in all other cittyes universities and townes at all times anie times (the time of divine service onlye excepted).' Though licensed to play in London there can be no doubt that this company was essentially a travelling one, for many traces of it are found in the provinces and none in London. The licence mentions Robert Lee, Martin Slater or Slaughter, and Roger Barfeld as the leading members of the company.[1] As Lee appeared with the London Queen's company on April 15, 1609, he probably did not remain long with Slater's company.[2]

On July 16, 1616, the Earl of Pembroke issued an order for the suppressing of this company, which he described as a company of 'vagabonds and such like idle psons . . . playinge in diuse places of this Realme to the great abuse and wronge of his Ma$^{ts}$ Sub$^{ts}$, etc.'[3] This order, however, was not strictly enforced, for Slater and his company often played after 1616.[4]

Between the issue of Pembroke's order and April, 1618, Slater's company and John Daniel's Children of Bristol, or as they were also called 'her Ma$^{ties}$ servants of her Royall Chamber of Bristoll,' seem to have amalgamated. Of this company Martin Slater, John Edmonds, and Nathaniel Clay are named. In all probability this union did not last long, the

[1] Cf. ii. 400, 343. Martin Slater last appeared in the Lord Admiral's company, *c.* 1597.
[2] Cf. below, 189.
[3] Cf. ii. 343-344.
[4] Cf. Provincial list below, 203 f.

Children of Bristol being reorganised and taken under the King's patronage, and Slater and his company being known as servants to Queen Anne.[1]

When, on May 13, 1619, the Queen's London company attended her funeral, Martin Slater and John Edmonds appeared with them, no doubt as the representatives of her provincial company, with which they were connected.[2] After the Queen's death this company was known as the players of the late Queen Anne.[3] They can be traced as late as October, 1625, when they played at Coventry and Leicester. At the former place Slater, Robson [Robinson], and Silvester are mentioned as members of the company. At the latter place they are termed 'the Kings Playors.'[4] This, no doubt, was because their licence was signed by the King, and not because that was their proper title, for at Coventry they are as usual called the players of the late Queen Anne. After 1625 this company is not heard of.

III

Meanwhile the Queen's London company continued to act at the Curtain, when the theatres were not closed by the plague. Then they probably travelled, for though the only certain reference to them in the provinces is at Coventry during 1608-9,[5] there can be no doubt that many of the provincial entries of the Queen's men refer to this company.

On April 15, 1609, these players obtained a new

[1] Cf. ii. 5. [2] Cf. below, 196-197. [3] *Ibid.*, 204-205.

[4] Cf. ii. 565. Probably 'Robson' is William Robinson, who no doubt joined Slater's company, when the London Queen's company broke up in 1623 (cf. below, 199).

[5] Cf. ii. 244-245.

Patent authorising them to play in 'theire nowe usual houses called the Redd Bull, in Clarkenwell, and the Curtayne, in Hallowell,' as well as in the provinces. The following members of the company are mentioned :—

Thomas Greene.
Christopher Beeston.
Thomas Heywood.
Richard Perkins.
'Richard' Pallant.
Thomas Swinnerton.
John Duke.
Robert Lee.
James Holt.
Robert Beeston.[1]

When this licence was granted the theatres were closed on account of the plague, which remained severe till December.[2] When they reopened, either in December, 1609, or early in 1610, the Queen's men almost certainly occupied the Red Bull. As the mention of that theatre in the 1609 Queen's Patent is the earliest we have, and the Curtain was an old theatre, it seems likely that the Red Bull was a new

[1] Shak. Soc. Pub., iv. 45. 'Richard' Pallantis undoubtedly a scribal slip for Robert Pallant. As Mr. Fleay suggests, the scribe's eye probably caught the 'Richard' of Richard Perkins in the preceding name (*Stage*, 191).

[2] Cf. ii. 187. Dekker in his *The Raven's Almanack* (*Stat. Reg.*, July 7, 1608) refers to a 'deadly war' between three theatres, which he expected would break out in the autumn of 1609. The companies referred to were in all probability the Queen's at the Curtain or their new theatre the Red Bull, the King's at the Globe, and the Prince's at the Fortune (Collier, i. 359-360 ; *Stage*, 207). This war, if Dekker's expectations about it were fulfilled, could not have broken out till December, 1609, or early in 1610, as the plague did not abate sufficiently to allow the reopening of the theatres till December.

theatre built for them about this time. At any rate from 1609 to 1623 the Queen's men were associated with this theatre.[1] Whether or not they at once gave up the Curtain after 1609 is uncertain. As it seems hardly probable that they continued to occupy both theatres, they may have resigned the Curtain to the Duke of York's men, who as the Prince's company occupied it in 1622.[2]

On May 29 and 30, and June 1, 1610, John Fryne of St. Olive's, feltmaker, Edward Brian of St. Bride's, feltmaker, William Tedcastle of St Andrew's, Holborn, yeoman, Edward Purfett of St. Olive's, Southwark, feltmaker, and Thomas Williams of St. Katherens near the Tower of London, feltmaker, were summoned to appear before the magistrate to answer for 'a notable outrage at the Playhouse called the Red Bull.'[3] The feltmakers seem to have had a grudge against either the Red Bull, or the Queen's company which was playing there, for in 1622 they threatened to pull down the theatre.[4]

[1] Cf. Thomas Greene's will, July, 1612 (*Stage*, 194); Papers concerning the Red Bull (*ibid.*, 194-199); title-page of plays (*ibid.*, 205, 307); the Baskerville lawsuit papers (*Stage*, 270-297).

[2] Mr. Fleay's statements on this point are not consistent (*Stage*, 188, 191, 201, 208, 301). The mention of the Globe, Curtain, and Fortune as the three leading playhouses in Heath's *Epigrams*, 1610, is of no value in settling the matter, as the exact time of writing the *Epigrams* is uncertain (Malone by Boswell, iii. 54; *Stage*, 208). Neither is Dekker's reference to the 'three houses,' probably the Globe, Curtain, and Fortune, in his *Raven's Almanack* (quarto, 1609; S.R., July 7, 1608) of any value in deciding this point.

[3] *Middlesex County Records*, ii. 64-65.

[4] Cf. below, 197. The magistrates were given much trouble by rowdyism in and about the Red Bull. On March 3, 1613, Alexander Fulsis, of Hoxton, County Middlesex, silkweaver, was charged 'to have pict a purse and iii li. in money in the same purse out of the pocket of one Robert Sweete at the Red Bull in St. John's Street' (*Middlesex County Records*, ii. 86).

IV

In January, 1612, a second travelling company, under the patronage of Queen Anne, was formed by Robt. Lee and Thomas Swinnerton. On Jan. 7 they obtained a duplicate of the Queen's London company's Patent of April 15, 1609.[1] In all probability James Holt, who is not heard of in the Queen's London company from 1612 to 1619, was also a member of the new company.[2]

These men appeared at Norwich on April 18, 1614, and were allowed to play on Wednesday, Thursday and Friday of Easter week.[3] On May 6, 1615, the company was again permitted to play in Norwich. The next year, on March 30, Lee and Swinnerton returned to Norwich, and presenting their licence, craved permission to play. As the rest of the company had not arrived in Norwich the Mayor's Court at first refused to allow them to play, but offered them a reward. When they refused this, the authorities relented and permitted them, and the Prince's players who had reached Norwich at the same time, to play four days in the following week. They stipulated, however, that the companies were to play, not at the White Horse Inn, near Tombland, but 'in the Chappell nere the Newhall.'[4] Later on this stipulation was so far modified as to allow the Queen's men to play for two days at the White Horse Inn.[5] On May 29, 1616, Swinnerton again came before the Mayor's Court at Norwich and asked

[1] Cf. ii. 343.

[2] Holt is not mentioned in Thomas Greene's will or the Baskerville papers (*Stage*, 192-194 ; 270-297).

[3] Cf. ii. 340. [4] *Ibid.*, 340-341. [5] *Ibid.*, 341.

leave to play. The Court refused his request, and told him, 'Yf you will play yo$^{w}$ must doe yt at yo$^{r}$ p$^{r}$ill w$^{th}$out o$^{r}$ leave.' His answer was, 'Wee will adventure the p$^{r}$ill and we meane on Monday next to play in the Cytty.' Later, however, when the Court offered him a gratuity he promised not to play.[1]

On July 16, 1616, the Earl of Pembroke issued an order for the suppression of Swinnerton and his company.[2] This order was brought to Norwich by Joseph More on June 4, 1617, just too late for the authorities to use it against Swinnerton's company, which had appeared in the city on May 31, and obtained permission to play on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday in Whitsun week, at the White Horse Inn.[3] On Swinnerton and his company Pembroke's order seems to have had little effect, for they frequently played in the provinces after its issue.[4]

By October 31, 1617, Robert Lee had left these men and joined Rossiter, Perry, and Long in the 4, Queen's Revels company.[5]

On May 13, 1619, Thomas Swinnerton, Robert Pallant, and James Holt attended the funeral of Queen Anne, with her London company.[6] After the Queen's death the company appeared as the players of the late Queen Anne till 1625,[7] when it was in all probability reorganised under Ellis Guest and Thomas Swinnerton, and played in the provinces as Ellis Guest's company.[8]

[1] Cf. ii. 341. [2] *Ibid.*, 343-344. [3] *Ibid.*, 343.

[4] Cf. below, 204. The travelling strength of this company, *c.* 1619, seems to have been fifteen men (cf. ii. 255).

[5] Cf. ii. 345 ; below, 361.

[6] Cf. below, 196-197. [7] *Ibid.*, 204-205. [8] Cf. ii. 101 f.

V

Turning again to the Queen's London company, we can make out from the will of Thomas Greene, dated July 25, 1612,[1] and the Baskervile lawsuit papers,[2] the following members of the company, *c.* 1612 :—

Thomas Greene.
Ellis Worth.
John Cumber.
John Blaney.
Christopher Beeston.
Thomas Heywood.
Francis Walpole.
Robert Reynolds.[3]
William Robins[on].
Thomas Drew.
Emanuel Read.
Richard Perkins.

Probably George Pulham, 'who died one of the said companie' not long before Thomas Greene (*d.* August, 1612), was one of their actors.[4] It is also not unlikely that William Browne, who is mentioned in Greene's will of 1612, and is spoken of as a player of the company in the Baskervile papers, was playing with the Queen's men *c.* 1612.[5]

[1] *Stage*, 192 f. [2] *Ibid.*, 270 f.

[3] The following entry in the *Middlesex County Records* probably has to do with this Reynolds : '1 March, 14 Jas. I. [1617]. True Bill, for not going to church, chapel or any usual place of Common Prayer on the said day, nor at any time during the two months next following . . . Jane, wife of . . . Reynoldes, stage player' (*Middlesex County Records*, ii. 127 ; also 120, where she is called wife of 'Robert Reynoldes, yoman').

[4] *Stage*, 280.

[5] Whether or not his brother Robert Browne was an actor is uncertain. If so, he was probably the Robert Browne who fell on evil days and became

On Oct. 4, 1616, a process was begun against 'Christofer Beeston and the rest of the players of the Redd Bull' for being five pounds behind in their contribution towards the repair of the highways in the neighbourhood of their theatre. It appears that they were 'taxed by the bench 40s. the yeare by theire owne consentes.'[1] On Oct. 2, 1617, Christopher Beeston, Thomas Heywood, Richard Perkins, Thomas Drew, Richard Harrison, and Ellis Worth representing the Red Bull company, petitioned the Sessions of the Peace against the various presentments which had been issued against them for not 'repayringe the Highwayes neere the Red Bull.' The Court, 'taking notice of the great charge they had been at in repayringe the said waies, It was ordered that further proces shold be staied upon those presentmentes.' However, on Oct. 3, 1622, the matter again came before the Middlesex Sessions, and it was ordered that 'forasmuch as the footewaies neere the said Red Bull, which ought to be repaired by the persons aforenamed, are nowe very farre out of repayre, and they doe obstinatelie refuse to amende the same It is therefore Ordered that Proces de Novo be awarded against them upon the former presentments.'[2]

About June 3, 1617, the following members of the company entered into a new agreement with Susan Baskervile :—

a puppet-player *c.* 1637-8 (cf. ii. 253, 359). Possibly Robert and William Browne were the sons of Robert Browne of Worcester's 1586 company, whose widow seems to have married Thomas Greene.

[1] *Middlesex County Records*, ii. 235.

[2] *Ibid.*, 170. Of the men who petitioned in 1617, Beeston, at least, had left the company by 1622 (cf. below, 197).

Christopher Beeston, *alias* Hutchinson.
Richard Perkins.
Thomas Heywood.
Ellis Worth.
John Cumber.
Francis Walpole.
Robert Reynolds.
John Blaney.
Thomas Basse.
William Robins[on].
Thomas Drew.
Emanuel Read.[1]

When the new Cockpit theatre in Drury Lane was opened, probably early in 1617,[2] the Queen's men seem to have occupied it, for on March 4, 1617, when the prentices partially wrecked it, it is spoken of as 'belonging to the Queen's Majesty's servants.'[3] When repaired it was probably reoccupied for a short time by the Queen's men, for about June 3, 1617, the Baskervile papers state that these players were 'now comme, or shortlie to comme from the said Playhowse called the Redd Bull to the Playhowse in Drurie Lane called the Cockpitt,'[4] and that the payments from the company to Susan Baskervile were 'to be paid att the play howse called the Cockpitt in Drurie Lane,'[5] or at any other theatre at which these men might in future perform. Soon,

[1] *Stage*, 286 f. For a statement of the details of the dispute between the Queen's company and Susan Baskervile, cf. *ibid.*, 271 f.

[2] This theatre is first mentioned in 1617.

[3] Malone by Boswell, iii. 494-495. Collier's ballad (Collier, i. 386) is of doubtful authenticity (cf. *Drama*, i. 296-297).

[4] *Stage*, 285.

[5] *Ibid.*, 286.

however, the Queen's men seem to have returned to the Red Bull,[1] for when Queen Anne died in 1619, her company naturally lost its title, and as the company of the Red Bull was the only company in London at this time not bearing the name of a royal patron, there can be little doubt that the Red Bull players were those who had been under the patronage of Queen Anne. Still more conclusive is the fact that in Herbert's list of the London companies of 1622, it is the old Queen's company which is found at the Red Bull.

On March 2, 1619, Queen Anne died. The following representatives of her London and provincial companies attended her funeral on May 13, and were allowed four yards of black cloth each :—

Robert Lee.
Richard Perkins.
Christopher Beeston.
Robert Pallant.
Thomas Heywood.
James Holt.
Thomas Swinnerton.
Martin Slater or Slaughter.
Ellis Worth.
John Cumber.
Thomas Basse.
John Blaney.

[1] The Cockpit was probably occupied by the Lady Elizabeth's men after the Queen's company left it (cf. below, 252). Mr. Fleay states that in 1617 the Queen's men were 'treating for an amalgamation with the Lady Elizabeth's men at the Cockpit' (*Stage*, 272). There is no evidence for this statement, which no doubt grew out of his theory that the Lady Elizabeth's men in 1625 became Queen Henrietta's men (cf. discussion of this theory below, 199 *n.*).

William Robins[on].
John Edmonds.
Thomas Drew.
Gregory Sanderson.
John Garrett.[1]

After the Queen's death her London company was known as the Red Bull company,[2] and the provincial companies as the players of the late Queen Anne.[3]

Between May 13, 1619, and July 8, 1622, Christopher Beeston joined the Lady Elizabeth's men, for his name appears in Herbert's 1622 list of that company[4] and is not found in the new licence of July 8, 1622, granted to the Red Bull company.[5]

In March, 1622, John Gill, a feltmaker, threatened Mr. Baxter and 'the other Redbull players to ruyn theire house and persons,' if they did not give him satisfaction for a wound he received from Baxter, while sitting on the stage during a play. Nothing seems to have come of this threat save a demonstration by the prentices before the Red Bull.[6]

On July 8, 1622, a warrant was issued to the Signet

[1] Collier, i. 397. Mr. Fleay supposes all these men belonged to the London company (*Stage*, 297).

[2] Cf. below. Mr. Fleay's statements on this point are contradictory. In his *Stage* (272, 297) he says the company was called 'the Revels Company' from 1619 to 1622. In his *Drama* (i. 213), on the other hand, he states that they were the company of the Red Bull till 1622 when they obtained their licence as the Revels company. The latter statement is undoubtedly the correct one.

[3] Cf. Provincial Lists, below, 204-205.

[4] Cf. below, 255.

[5] Cf. below. There is no evidence to support Mr. Fleay's conjecture that Thomas Heywood also joined the Lady Elizabeth's men between 1619 and 1622 (*ibid.*, 256 *n.*).

[6] *Middlesex County Records*, ii. 165, 175.

Office for a Privy Seal for the King's signature for the licensing of

Robert Lee,
Richard Perkins,
Ellis Worth,
Thomas Basse,
John Blaney,
John Cumber,
and William Robins[on],

'late Commedians to Queene Anne deceased to bring up Children in the quallitie and exercise of playinge Commedyes Histories Enterludes Morralle pastoralls Stage playes and such other like aswell for the Sollace and pleasure of his Matie as for the honest recreacion of such as shall desier to see them to be called by the name of the Children of the Revells, etc.' By July 25 the business between the Signet Office and the Lord Chamberlain over the issue of this licence was completed, and no doubt the Patent was delivered to the players.[1]

Under the date 1622, Sir Henry Herbert noted in his office book, that 'The names of the chiefe players at the Red Bull, called the players of the Revels,' were

Robert Lee.
Richard Perkins.
Ellis Worth.
Thomas Basse.
John Blaney.
John Cumber.
and William Robins[on].[2]

[1] Cf. ii. 194.

[2] Malone by Boswell, iii. 59.

In all probability this company broke up about May, 1623, for the last sure mention of it is dated May 10, 1623, when Herbert allowed 'A new Play, called, *The Welsh* [*Witch*] *Traveller* . . . to be acted by the players of the Revels,'[1] and by August, 1623, Prince Charles's men were acting at the Red Bull, where the Revels company had played.[2] Moreover, on May 23, 1623, when Ellis Worth, John Cumber, and John Blaney pleaded to be excused from their payments to Susan Baskervile, they stated that since they had entered into their agreement to pay 3s. 8d. per diem while four of the Queen Anne's company held together, 'all your oratours said fellowes that sealed to the said deed of Indenture and bands are dead, or departed from your oratours to some other company.'[3] Only a few of the Revels

[1] *Supplemental Apology*, 213 ; *Drama*, ii. 325.

[2] Cf. below, 236.

[3] *Stage*, 278. When in 1626 this case was decided, the court dismissed the plea of Worth and Blaney, the two surviving plaintiffs, and so virtually found for the defendants (*ibid.*, 296). Probably the ground for this decision was that when Worth, Blaney, and Cumber gave their bonds for the daily payment of 3s. 8d. to Susan Baskervile and William Browne during their life, while four of the Queen Anne's company held together, they also agreed to obtain new players for the company when any of the old players left it, and consequently were really responsible for the payment during the life of the defendants (*ibid.*, 287). Mr. Fleay as part of his theory that the 'Revels' Company was 'virtually absorbed' into the Lady Elizabeth's company by 1623, states that Worth, Cumber, Blaney, and Robinson joined the Lady Elizabeth's men in that year (*ibid.*, 272). Apparently his evidence for this is, that in the lists of Queen Henrietta's company about 1626 and later, he finds the names of Robinson and Blaney, and as this company occupied the Cockpit, where the Lady Elizabeth's men had played before 1625, he considers that Robinson and Blaney belonged to that company before 1625, and that Queen Henrietta's company is the Lady Elizabeth's under new patronage. This evidence, however, is unsatisfactory, as Robinson was in all probability playing with Slater's Queen Anne travelling company in 1625, and so, no doubt, joined them in 1623 (cf. below, 200), and the theory that the Lady Elizabeth's company passed

men can be traced after May, 1623. Richard Perkins joined the King's men, with whom he appeared on March 27, 1625;[1] Richard Baxter is mentioned in the licence of April 9, 1623, granted to William Perry's 'Children of the Revels of the late Queen Anne';[2] William Robson [Robinson] played with Martin Slater's travelling company, known as 'servants to the late Queen Anne,' on October 16, 1625, at Coventry;[3] John Cumber died between May 25 and June 16, 1623;[4] Ellis Worth is next heard of as a member of Prince Charles's company of 1631,[5] and John Blaney appeared with Queen Henrietta's men in 1626.[6] Of the other members of the company nothing further is known.[7]

in 1625 under the patronage of Queen Henrietta is untenable (*ibid.*, 265 *n.*). As regards the careers of Cumber and Worth and the other members of the Revels company after May, 1623, compare below.

[1] See below, opposite 172.

[2] *Ibid.*, 362.

[3] Cf. ii. 250.

[4] *Stage*, 273, 285.

[5] Cf. below, 218.

[6] *Ibid.*, 265-266.

[7] Mr. Fleay's guess that some of the Revels company went to the Continent in 1623 may be true, but there is no evidence to support it (*Stage*, 273). His identification of Robert Lee as Robert Pickelherring, and Thomas Basse as Thomas the Warden, of the Torgau company of April 1, 1627 (*Stage*, 329), is, of course, quite wrong (Herz, *Englische Schauspieler und englisches Schauspiel zur Zeit Shakespeares in Deutschland*, p. 31). It is also improbable that the words about players fleeing before the plague in Dekker's *Runaway's Answer*, 1625, refer to any particular company of players (cf. *Stage*, 329).

## COURT PERFORMANCES

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1604. Jan. 2, . . . | | (Queen Anne's players).[1] |
| Jan. 13, . . . | | ( ,, ).[1] |
| Dec. 30, . . . | [*How to learn of a Woman to Woo*]. | ( ,, ).[2] |
| 1605. Dec. 27, . . | | ( ,, ).[3] |
| 1610-11, . . . . | Three plays. | ( ,, ).[4] |
| 1611. Dec. 27, . . | [*The City Gallant*]. | ( ,, ).[5] |
| [Jan. 12, . . . | *The Silver Age.* | ( ,, )].[5] |
| [Jan. 13, . . . | *Lucretia.* | ( ,, )].[5] |
| Jan. 16, . . . | | ( ,, ).[5] |
| Jan. 23, . . . | | ( ,, ).[5] |
| Feb. 2, . . . | [*Tu Quoque*]. | ( ,, ).[5] |
| 1613. Dec. 28, . . | | ( ,, ).[6] |
| 1614. Jan. 5, . . . | | ( ,, ).[6] |

[1] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxv. On Feb. 19, 1604, John Duke was paid £13, 6s. 8d. for two plays performed by the Queen's men before Prince Henry on Jan. 2 and 13.

[2] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxvi, 204. On Feb. 19, 1605, John Duke was paid £6, 13s. 4d. and given a reward of 46s. 8d. for a play performed by the Queen's men before King James on Sunday night, Dec. 30. The name of the play is given by Cunningham in his *Book of Revels* for 1604-5, which is of very doubtful authenticity (cf. *Stage*, 171, 173-174, 177).

[3] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxviii. On April 30, 1606, John Duke was paid £5 and given a reward of 46s. 8d. for a play performed by the Queen's men before King James on 'St. Johns day at night.'

[4] Cunningham, *Revels*, xl. On March 18, 1611, Thomas Green was paid £30 for three plays performed by the Queen's men before King James and Prince Henry.

[5] Cunningham, *Revels*, xli, 211. On June 18, 1612, Thomas Greene was paid 40 nobles and given a reward of £6, 13s. 4d. for two plays performed by the Queen's men before the King and Queen on Dec. 27, 1611, and Feb. 2, 1612; and £13, 6s. 8d. for two plays before the Prince and Lady Elizabeth on Jan. 16 and 23, 1612. The play names are from Cunningham's doubtful *Revels Book* for 1611-12, as are also the performances for Jan. 12 and 13 at Greenwich; these, according to Cunningham, were before the Queen and Prince.

[6] Cunningham, *Revels*, xliii. On June 21, 1614, Robert Lee was paid £20 for two performances by the Queen's players before the King, the one on Dec. 28, 1613, the other on Jan. 5, 1614.

## PROVINCIAL VISITS

From March 7, 1605, till 1622 there were two Queen Anne's companies, one the London company, which during 1622-23 was called the Revels Co., and the other Martin Slater's travelling company, which continued to play till 1625. In Jan., 1612, a third Queen Anne's company was formed under Thomas Swinnerton. It played in the provinces till 1624. In the following lists I have distinguished these companies whenever possible. In the majority of cases, however, there is nothing in the provincial records to indicate which company is meant.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1604-5. March, '05, | Southampton. | (Slater's Queen's Co.). |
| [After Jan. 19, '05], | Leicester. | (The Queen's players). |
| 1605-6. July 25, '06, | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |
| Dec. 15, '05–Nov. 3, '06, | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| Sept. 4, '06, | Ludlow. | ( ,, ). |
| [Oct.], '05–Oct. 10, '06, | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| | Exeter. | ( ,, ). |
| 1606-7. [After Sept., '06], | York. | ( ,, ). |
| [After Oct. 17, '06], | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |
| '07, | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 3, '06–Nov. 25, '07, | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| '07, | Barnstaple. | ( ,, ). |
| 1607-8. Before March, '08, | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| June 6, '08, | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| [Oct., '07]—Oct. 16, '08, | Bath, | ( ,, ). |
| 1608-9. Sept. 26, '08, | Leicester, | ( ,, ).[1] |
| | Shrewsbury. | ( ,, ). |
| | Marlborough. | ( ,, ). |
| ['09], | Canterbury. | ( ,, ). |
| Between July 8 and Aug. 9, '09, | Dover. | ( ,, ). |

[1] This was not the same company of Queen's players as appeared in Leicester on June 6, 1608 (cf. ii. 310).

| | |
|---|---|
| After June, '09, | Coventry. (The London Queen's Co.). |
| 1609-10. Oct. 15, '09, | Norwich. (The Queen's players). |
| [*c.* March 23, '10], | Maidstone. ( ,, ). |
| 1610-11. Nov. 2, '10, | Ipswich. ( ,, ). |
| Dec. 31, '10, | Leicester. ( ,, ). |
| | Shrewsbury. ( ,, ). |
| | Southampton. ( ,, ). |
| 1611-12. Between Ap. 11 and May 9, '12, | Dover. ( ,, ). |
| June 14, '12, | Leicester. ( ,, ). |
| Bet. Aug. 29 and Sept. 29, '12, | Dover. ( ,, ). |
| 1612-13, | Ipswich. ( ,, ). |
| Oct. 26, '12, | Leicester. ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 25, '12–Nov. 23, '13, | Coventry. ( ,, ). |
| Feb. 18, '13, | Marlborough. ( ,, ). |
| March 16, '13, | Leicester. ( ,, ). |
| Bet. Ap. 13 and May 15, '13, | Dover. ( ,, ). |
| 1613-14. Nov. 2, '13, | Marlborough. ( ,, ). |
| Dec. 22, '13, | Leicester. ( ,, ). |
| | Shrewsbury. ( ,, ). |
| | Marlborough. ( ,, ). |
| April 18, '14, | Norwich. (Swinnerton's Co.). |
| Bet. Sept. 3 and 29, '14, | Dover. (The Queen's Players). |
| 1614-15. April 15, '15, | Coventry. ( ,, ). |
| April or May, '15, | Leicester. ( ,, ). |
| [After Feb. 3, '15], | Doncaster, ( ,, ). |
| May 6, '15, | Norwich. (Swinnerton's Co.). |
| | Barnstaple. (The Queen's players). |
| 1615-16. Oct. 16, '15, | Leicester. ( ,, ). |
| Soon after Oct. 16, '15, | Leicester. (Another Queen's Co.). |
| Oct. 26, '15, | Marlborough. (The Queen's players). |
| 1615-16. Nov. 5, '15–Nov. 4, '16, | Southampton. ( ,, ). |
| | Barnstaple. ( ,, ). |
| Jan., '16, | Nottingham. ( ,, ). |
| Bet. Jan. 20 and Feb. 17, '16, | Dover. ( ,, ). |
| [Feb. 17, '16], | Coventry. ( ,, ). |

| | |
|---|---|
| Feb. 22, '16, . . . | Leicester. (The Queen's players). |
| March 30, '16, . . . | Norwich. (Swinnerton's Co.). |
| Bet. May 11 and June 8, '16, | Dover. (The Queen's players). |
| May 29, '16, . . . | Norwich. (Swinnerton's Co.). |
| 1616-17. Feb. 6, '17, . . | Leicester. (The Queen's players). |
| After Feb. 6, '17, . . | Leicester. (Another Queen's Co.). |
| | Nottingham. (The Queen's players). |
| | Nottingham. (The London Queen's Co.). |
| Bet. March 22 and Ap. 19, '17, | Dover. (The Queen's players). |
| May 31, '17, . . . | Norwich. (Swinnerton's Co.). |
| 1617-18. Bet. Nov. 1 and Nov. 29, '17, . . . . | Southampton. ( ,, ). |
| Dec. 3, '17, . . . | Dover. (The Queen's players). |
| Dec. 16, '17, . . . | Coventry. ( ,, ). |
| | Leicester. ( ,, ). |
| 1618-19. Bet. Oct. and Nov. 18, '18, . . . . | Nottingham. ( ,, ). |
| Dec. 6, '18, . . . | ( ,, ). |
| | Ludlow. (Martin Slater's Co.). |
| '19, . . . . . | Winchester. (The Queen's players). |
| | Leicester. Swinnerton's Co.). |
| '19, . . . . . | Craven District (Skipton Castle). (The late Queen Anne's players). |
| 1619-20. Bet. March 18 and Ap. 15, '20, . . . . | Dover. ( ,, ). |
| March 29, '20, . . . | Coventry. (Swinnerton's Co.). |
| [Near end of 1620], . . | Marlborough. (The late Queen Anne's players). |
| 1620-21. Dec. 23, '20, . . | Coventry. (Martin Slater's Co.). |
| [*c.* Dec. '20], . . . | Nottingham. (The late Queen Anne's players). |
| | Marlborough. ( ,, ). |
| 1621-22. Dec. 21, '21, . . | Leicester. ( ,, ). |
| After Aug. 26, '22, . . | Leicester. ( ,, ). |

(After *c.* May 1622 there was no London Queen Anne's company.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1622-23. Jan. 24–Aug. 28, '23, | Coventry. | (Martin Slater's Co.). |
| 1623-24. Jan. 27, '24, . . | Leicester. | (The late Queen Anne's players). |
| March 20, '24, . . . | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| | Nottingham. | ( ,, ). |
| 1624-25. Dec. 27, '24, . . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| Dec. '24, . . . . | Coventry. | (Martin Slater's Co.). |

(After March 16, 1625, Slater's was probably the only Queen Anne's company.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Oct. 15, '25, . . . | Leicester. | (Martin Slater's Co.). |
| Oct. 16, '25, . . . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |

## III

## PRINCE HENRY—1, PALSGRAVE—3, PRINCE CHARLES'S COMPANIES

On May 5, 1603, the Admiral's Company ceased playing at the Fortune, Golden Lane, St. Giles, without Cripplegate, 'now at the King's cominge.'[1] If they began acting again on May 9, when Worcester's men re-opened at the Rose, they cannot have acted for more than two weeks in London, for by May 26 the weekly plague death-rate had risen to thirty, and the theatres were closed, not to be re-opened till 1604.[2] During this time the Admiral's men acted in the provinces, appearing in Coventry, Leicester (Aug. 18), York, and Bath.

[1] *Diary*, ed. Greg., 174. That the Admiral's men were acting at the Fortune is clear. Henslowe and Alleyne owned two theatres, the Rose on the Bankside, and the Fortune in Golden Lane, the latter finished in 1600 (cf. above, 129-130). Now, in Henslowe's *Diary* are two overlapping accounts of the Admiral's and Worcester's men; the former from August, 1600, to March, 1603 (*Diary*, ed. Greg, 124-174), the latter from August, 1602, to March 16, 1603 (*Diary*, 179-190). Though in neither case is the theatre mentioned, the following entries indicate the theatre of each company:—(1) 'Receiued of mr. Philip Hinchloes in earnest of the Booke of Shoare, now newly to be written for the Earle of worcester's players at the Rose of mr Henchoes xls. J say receiued . . .' (*Diary*, ed. Greg, 160.) (2) 'Lent at the apoyntment of Thomas hewode & John ducke vnto harey Chettell and John daye in earneste of a playe wherein Shores wiffe is writen the some of . . . xxxxs.' (*Diary*, ed. Greg, 190.) As the second of these entries obviously refers to the same play as the first, and is dated about May 9, 1603, the inference is that on that date Worcester's men were playing at the Rose, and consequently the Admiral's at the Fortune.

[2] Cf. ii. 185.

When the London theatres re-opened, about April, 1604, this company, which had passed under the patronage of Prince Henry,[1] began playing at their former theatre, the Fortune.[2]

On March 15, 1604, when James made his public entry into London, the following members of the Prince's company walked in the procession, and were allowed four yards of red cloth each :—

Edward Alleyn.
William Bird.
Thomas Towne.
Thomas Dutton.
Samuel Rowley.
Edward Juby.
Humphrey Jeffes.
Charles Massey.
Antony Jeffes.[3]

[1] Gilbert Dugdale, *Time Triumphant*, 1604, says, 'Nay, see the beauty of our all kinde soveraigne ! not only to the indifferent of worth, and worthy of honour, did he freely deale about these causes, but to the meane gave grace ; as taking to him the late Lord Chamberlain's servants, now the King's acters ; the Queen taking to her the Earl of Worster's servants, that are now her acters ; and the Prince, their son, Henry, Prince of Wales full of hope, tooke to him the Earl of Nottingham his servants, who are now his acters.' Mr. Fleay supposed that the Admiral's men became Prince Henry's men in May, 1603, when the Chamberlain's men became the King's men (*Stage*, 190). But this cannot have been so, for then the Company would certainly have appeared in the provinces during the summer of 1603 as the Prince's men and not as the Admiral's or Earl of Nottingham's servants. The earliest mention of them as Prince's men is on February 19, 1604, when they were paid for Court performances on January 4, 15, 20, and 22. Not improbably the Prince took them under his patronage about the time of their first performance at Court, January 4, 1604.

[2] As the Admiral's company had acted at the Fortune, since its erection in 1600 (cf. above, 206 *n.*) there can be little doubt that the letter of April 9, 1604 (cf. above, 149) mentions the companies and the theatres at which they were acting in different orders, and that the Admiral-Prince's company was acting at the Fortune and not at the Curtain as the letter seems to imply.

[3] Cf. New. Shak. Soc. Pub., 1877-79, App. ii. p. 17.

In all probability, Edward Alleyn did not act after 1604.[1]

During 1604 and 1605 there was little plague in London, and dramatic entertainments were not interfered with. Nevertheless, the Prince's men made a short provincial tour in 1604-5, visiting Maidstone and Winchester. By July 10, 1606, the plague deaths had risen to above thirty a week, and the theatres were closed.[2] The Prince's players travelled, appearing at Bath and Ipswich (Oct. 17). The plague continued severe in London till January, 1607, when the theatres were no doubt reopened.

On April 30, 1607, the Prince's players were granted a new Patent. It authorised them to play not only 'within their nowe usuall house called the Fortune,' but 'also within the libertie and fredome of any other citie, university, towne, or buroughe whatsoever, within our realmes and domynions.' The following members of the company are named:—

Thomas Dutton.
Thomas Towne.
William Bird.
Edward Juby.
Samuel Rowley.
Humphrey Jeffes.
Charles Massey.
Antony Jeffes.[3]

In July, 1607, the plague became severe enough to cause the closing of the theatres. They were not reopened till December. In the following July

[1] Cf. ii. 140-141.
[2] *Ibid.*, 186.
[3] *Shak. Soc. Papers*, iv. 42-43.

they were again closed on account of the plague, which continued severe till Dec., 1609, when the theatres probably reopened.[1] From July to December, 1610, they were again closed on account of the plague.[2] During these plague years the Prince's men visited the following provincial towns: —1607-8, Maidstone, Bath, Leicester (Oct. 1, '08); 1608-9, Shrewsbury, Hereford; 1609-10, Shrewsbury; 1610-11 [Oct. or Nov., 1610], Shrewsbury, Winchester.

In the Book of the Household Establishment of Prince Henry, dated 1610, occurs the following list of the Prince's players:—

'Comedyones and Playores.'

'Thomas Towne.
Thomas Downton.
Wm Byrde.
Samuelle Rowleye.
Edward Jubye.
Charles Massye.
Humfrey Jeffes.
Anthony Jeffes.
Edward Colbrande.
Wm Parre.
Rychard Pryore.
William Stratford.
ffranncys Grace.
John Shanke.'[3]

[1] Dekker expected a keen rivalry between the Prince's men at the Fortune, the King's at the Globe, and the Queen's at the Curtain, when the theatres opened in the autumn of 1609 (cf. *Raven's Almanac*; also above, 152-153.)

[2] Cf. ii. 187.

[3] *Harl. MSS.*, 252. Collier, who dates this list 'immediately after' the accession of James I., has the following inexplicable note on the subject: 'Dr. Birch, in the Appendix to his *Life of Prince Henry*, p. 455, enumer-

The audiences of Prince Henry's men at the Fortune seem to have been particularly unruly. Thus on Feb. 26, 1611, two butchers, Ralph Brewyn and John Lynsey, were charged with 'abusing certen gentlemen at the playhouse called the Fortune,'[1] and on Oct. 1, 1612, the General Session of the Peace at Westminster thought it necessary to issue an order suppressing all 'Jigges, Rymes and Daunces' at the end of plays. The reason for this order was thus stated, 'that by reason of certayne lewde jigges, songes, and daunces used and accustomed at the play-house called the Fortune in Goulding lane divers cutt-purses and other lewde and ill disposed persons in greate multitudes doe resorte thither at the end of everye playe many tymes causinge tumultes and outrages wherebye His Majesties peace is often broke and much mischiefe like to ensue thereby.'[2]

About April 11, 1612, an actor by the name of Rose contemplated joining the Prince's men, and tried to obtain a position as 'gatherer' for his wife.[3]

ates Anthony Jeffes, but he does not quote his authority: Anthony Jeffes was, of course, one of the "two Jeffes" mentioned by Henslowe in 1597. Chalmers only follows Dr. Birch, not having examined the original document quoted in the text above' (Collier, i. 338). As Anthony Jeffes is mentioned in the MS., which is correctly quoted by Dr. Birch, this note of Collier's is particularly irritating. As regards the date of the MS. Mr. Fleay follows Collier, but with the following note: 'From the omission of Edward Allen and Antony Jeffes . . . I infer that it [*i.e.* the above list of players] is dated too early. I believe the true date to be 1608' (*Stage*, 200). If Mr. Fleay had examined the MS. he would have found it dated distinctly 'James R. 1610.'

[1] *Middlesex County Records*, ii. 71.

[2] *Ibid.*, ii. 83-84.

[3] Warner, *Cat. Dul. MSS.*, 35; Collier, *Alleyn Papers*, 51. The dishonesty of one of the company's 'gatherers,' John Russell by name, caused the Prince's men some trouble. They intended to dismiss him, but at

As his name appears in no list of the company, he either failed to join the company or held a minor position in it. Between 1610 and Nov. 5, 1612, Thomas Towne died,[1] and before Aug. 9, 1613, Antony Jeffes had left the company, receiving £70 for his interest in it.[2]

On Nov. 6, 1612, Prince Henry died. His players soon after passed under the patronage of the Palsgrave or Elector Palatine of the Rhine, who had arrived in England in October for the purpose of marrying the Princess Elizabeth. On Jan. 4, 1613, the company received a new Patent, in which the following players are mentioned :—

Thomas Dutton.
William Bird.
Edward Juby.
Samuel Rowley.
Charles Massey.
Humphrey Jeffs.
Francis Grace.
William Cartwright.
Edward Colbrand.
William Parr.
William Stratford.
Richard Gunnell.
John Shank.
Richard Price.[3]

A serious 'outrage' occurred at the Fortune on

Alleyn's desire retained him as 'a nessessary atendaunt on the stage,' and a mender of their garments (Warner, *Cat. Dul. MSS.*, 49 ; Collier, *Alleyn Papers*, 32-33).

[1] Warner, *Cat. Dul. MSS.*, 138 ; 36.

[2] *Ibid.*, 36.

[3] Collier, i. 366.

June 5, 1613, when one Richard Bradley assaulted Nicholas Bestney, 'junior gentleman,' and severely wounded him. The Palsgrave's players seem to have been held in no way responsible for this occurrence.[1]

The Palsgrave and the Princess Elizabeth were married at Shrovetide, 1613, and left England about the end of April. Their dramatic companies continued to act in England.

On Oct. 31, 1618, the Palsgrave's men leased the Fortune from Edward Alleyn for thirty-one years at a yearly rent of £200 and 'two rundlettes of wyne, the one sack and the other clarett, of ten shillinges a peece price.' It was also provided that in case of Alleyn's death within the term, the rent should be reduced to £120 for the residue, and that the lessees were not to 'convert the said playhowse to any other vse or vses then as the same is now vsed.' In this transaction the following members of the company are named :—

Edward Juby.
William Bird.
Francis Grace.
Richard Gunnell.
Charles Massey.
William Stratford.
William Cartwright.
Richard Price.
William Parr.
Richard Fowler.[2]

[1] *Middlesex County Records*, ii. 88-89.

[2] Warner, *Cat. Dul. MSS.*, 242, 243 ; also Collier, *Memoirs of Edw. Alleyn*, 155. For further interesting details in Alleyn's diary concerning the transaction, cf. Warner, *Cat. Dul. MSS.*, 175.

On July 21, 1621, the Spanish ambassador, Gondemar, was given a banquet by the Palsgrave's players. Mr. Chamberlain, who mentions the occurrence in a letter to Sir Dudley Carleton, says:—'The Spanish Ambassador, who is grown so affable and familiar, that on Monday with his whole Traine he went to a Common Play at the Fortune in Golden-land, and the Players (not to be overcome with courtesy) made him a Banquet, when the Play was done, in the garden adjoining.' [1]

The Fortune was burnt on Dec. 9, 1621. Alleyn thus laconically notes the fact in his diary:—'Md. this night att 12 of y^e^ clock y^e^ Fortune was burnt.' [2] Some further details of the catastrophe are found in a letter of Dec. 15, from Mr. Chamberlain to Sir Dudley Carleton; he says: 'On Sunday night, here was a great fire at the Fortune in Golding Lane, the fairest playhouse in this town. It was quite burned down in two hours, and all their apparel and playbooks lost, whereby these poor Companions are quite undone.' [3]

With characteristic enterprise, Alleyn began the building of a new Fortune on the same site before April 16, 1622.[4] He divided the new theatre into twelve shares, and on May 20, 1622, granted leases 'of whole shares for 51 years at a rent of 10*l.* 13*s.* 10*d.* to Richard Gunnell, Edw. Jackson, Thomas Sparkes, and Anthoney Jarman, and leases of half-

[1] Nicols, *Progresses*, iv. 671.

[2] Warner, *Cat. Dul. MSS.*, 190.

[3] *Court and Times of James I.*, vol. ii. p. 280. Mr. Fleay (*Stage*, 152) follows Collier (*Drama*, iii. 120) who carelessly read 'first' for 'fairest' in this letter.

[4] Warner, *Cat. Dul. MSS.*, 191.

shares for 51 years at a rent of 5*l.* 6*s.* 11*d.* to Frances Juby, George Massey, Richard Price, John Fisher, Thomas Wigpitt, and Charles Massey. Further leases at the same rents were made to Margaret Graye of a half-share for 50 years, 1 Aug., 1623, and a whole share for 40½ [49½] years, 29 Jan., 162¾; to George Bosgrave and John Blak of half-shares for 49½ years, 20 Feb., 162¾; to Mary Brown of a whole share for 49¼ years, 24 Mar., 162¾; and to Thomas Gibborne of a whole share of 40¼ [49¼] years, 21 Ap., 1624.'[1] Each shareholder had to pay £41, 13s. 4d. towards the erection of the new theatre, and the half-sharers in proportion.[2] The new Fortune was to be a 'large round brick building,' in contrast to the old one, which was square and chiefly made of wood.[3] It was probably completed between May 31, 1623, when the Palsgrave's men were at Norwich,[4] and July 27, 1623, when Herbert licensed 'A French Tragedy of Richard III., or the English Profit' for that company.[5]

In 1622 Sir Henry Herbert mentions the following men as members of the Palsgrave's company :—

Francis Grace,
Charles Massey,
Richard Price,
Richard Fowler,
Andrew Cane,
Curtis Greville,

[1] Warner, *Cat. Dul. MSS.*, 246-247.

[2] *Ibid.*, 243-245. Jarman paid only £33, 6s. 8d. for his share. As he was a carpenter he probably paid the remaining £7, 6s. 8d. in work and materials.

[3] Wright, *Historia Histrionica*, 1699.

[4] Cf. below, 227.

[5] Cf. Fleay, *Stage*, 301.

and three others whose names are indecipherable.[1] One of these was no doubt Richard Gunnell, who on May 20, 1622, is mentioned as a full shareholder in the new Fortune. In all probability William Bird, *alias* Bourne, William Cartwright, William Parr, Thomas Hunt, and George Bosgrave were also members of the company in 1622.[2] In April, 1621, Bird, or Bourne, is mentioned as a member of the company;[3] Cartwright on April 9, 1620,[4] April 15, 1621,[5] and Aug. 18, 1622;[6] and Parr on April 9, 1620.[7] Hunt, who was a member of the Lady Elizabeth's company in 1611,[8] seems to have joined the Palsgrave's men by 1621, for his name appears in the list of those players who dined with Alleyn on April 15, 1621.[9] As he is not mentioned in the leases of 1618 or 1622, he was evidently not a shareholder in the company. George Bosgrave, who obtained a lease of 'half of a twelfth part' of the Fortune on Feb. 20, 162$\frac{3}{4}$, had been a member of the 'Children of the Revels to the late Queen Anne.'[10] Andrew Cane and Curtis Greville appear in the 1622 Herbert lists of both the Palsgrave's and the Lady Elizabeth's players.[11] As neither of these men was mentioned in the fairly complete list of the Palsgrave's men in 1618, and there is nothing to indicate that they were not in the Lady Elizabeth's

[1] Malone by Boswell, iii. 59.

[2] Mr. Fleay seems to conclude that Bird, Cartwright, and Parr left the Palsgrave's men in 1618 (*Stage*, 370 f.). Of Hunt after 1611 he knows nothing. Bosgrave he does not mention.

[3] Warner, *Cat. Dul. MSS.*, 188.

[4] *Ibid.*, 183.

[5] *Ibid.*, 188.

[6] *Ibid.*, 193.

[7] *Ibid.*, 184.

[8] Cf. below, 243.

[9] Warner, *Cat. Dul. MSS.*, 188.

[10] Cf. ii. 272-273.

[11] Malone by Boswell, iii. 59, 60.

company from 1618 to 1622, the probabilities are that when the new Fortune was building in 1622, and the Palsgrave's men were preparing to open there, Cane and Greville joined them from the Lady Elizabeth's men. This theory is strengthened by the fact that later on Cane appears in 3, Prince Charles's Company, which seems to have been a continuation of the Palsgrave's company.[1]

[1] Cf. below, 218. Collier suggested in explanation of the fact that Herbert mentions Cane and Greville in both the Palsgrave's and Lady Elizabeth's companies in 1622, that these men were members of both companies at the same time (*Drama*, i. 410). This is, on the face of it, highly improbable. Mr. Fleay's theory is that early in 1621 Cane and Greville were members of the Palsgrave's company. When the Fortune was burnt on December 9, 1621, Cane and Greville were ruined and went over to the Lady Elizabeth's men. Then, when the new Fortune was opened in 1623, Cane returned to the Palsgrave's men and Greville either remained with the Lady Elizabeth's men for some time or went to the King's men, with whom he appeared in 1628 (*Stage*, 298). Mr. Fleay's evidence for this theory seems to be, in the first place, that Herbert in his 1622 lists of the companies mentions no theatre for the Palsgrave's men, and does for the other companies. The reason for this Mr. Fleay supposes to be, that when the lists were made out, the Fortune had been burnt and the Palsgrave's men had no theatre, and consequently were not acting. In the second place, that as the 1622 list of the Palsgrave's men is mentioned before the other lists, it actually antedates them. The inadequacy of this evidence is obvious. Herbert in his entries is not so careful in mentioning the theatre at which a company was playing, that the omission of it may not be an oversight, or considered by him unnecessary. Moreover, Mr. Fleay's evidence forces us to conclude that the Palsgrave's men did not act from the time of the burning of the old Fortune, December 9, 1621, till the completion of the new Fortune, *c.* June 1623. This is enough to overthrow his theory, considering that there were many inn-yards in London which could be used for plays, and that the Rose was still standing. (In fact, Alleyn seems to have still had an interest in the Rose in 1622, for on June 17 of that year he paid 'y^e^ tyeth dwe for y^e^ rose—00-01-0' (Warner, *Cat. Dul. MSS.*, 192).) Besides there is definite evidence that the Palsgrave's men acted in the Provinces in 1622-3, for on January 13, 1622, they were at Leicester, and on May 31, 1623, at Norwich (cf. below, 227). Mr. Fleay's second piece of evidence is quite valueless, as Herbert gives no indication that one list of players antedates another in 1622. There can be little doubt then, that Mr. Fleay's rather far-fetched theory is incorrect.

On May 31, 1623, the Palsgrave's men, or as they were called in the Mayor's Court Book, 'the players of the ffortune howse in London,' visited Norwich, and entered a protest 'against Willm Danyell who hath iniuriously gotten their Letters Patents.'[1] After this they did not again appear in the provinces till 1626.

A great riot occurred at the Fortune on May 16, 1626, when some sailors beat Francis Foster, the Constable, Edward Heather, the Headborough, and Thomas Faulkener, 'an inhabitant at the Fortune Playhouse,' and threatened to pull down the theatre and 'the Bear Garden.' These threats, however, came to nothing, as neither the Fortune nor the Bear Garden was injured.[2]

On May 29, 1630, Prince Charles was born, and on Dec. 7, 1631, the Palsgrave's company seems to have passed under his patronage. This change of patronage is indicated by the disappearance of the Palsgrave's company, under that name, after Sept., 1631, and the appearance of Andrew Cane and Richard Fowler, members of that company, in the first approximately complete list of the Prince's men in 1632.[3] Besides, the following lines from the Prologue to Marmion's *Holland's Leaguer* (S. R., Jan. 26, 1632), acted by the Prince's men, show that that company was an old London company acting at a new theatre, and not an entirely new company made up to play under the Prince's patronage :—

> 'Gentle spectators, that with gracefull eyes
> Come to behold the Muses Colonie,

[1] Cf. ii. 347.
[2] Cf. *Middlesex County Records*, iii. 161.
[3] Cf. below, 218-219.

New planted in this sayle; forsooke of late
By the Inhabitants, since made fortunate
By more propitious starres; though on each hand
To over-top us, two great Lawrels stand;
The one, when she shall please to spread her traine,
The vastnesse of the Globe cannot containe;
Th' other so high, the Phœnix does aspire
To build in, and takes new life from the fire
Bright Poesie creates; yet we partake
The Influence they boast of, which does make
Our Bayes to flourish, and the leaves to spring,
That on our branches now new Poets sing;
And when with Joy hee shall see this resort,
Phœbus shall not disdaine to stile 't his Court.'

The exact date of this change of patronage was undoubtedly Dec. 7, 1631, when 'Joseph More Ellias Worth Mathew Smyth and others' were granted a new licence.[1]

To Marmion's *Holland's Leaguer*, which is described in Jan., 1632, as having been 'lately and often acted' by Prince Charles's men at Salisbury Court Theatre, is prefixed the following list of actors and their parts :—

| | |
|---|---|
| 'Philautus, *a Lord inamord of himselfe* . . . . | William Browne. |
| Ardelio, *his parasite*, . . | Ellis Worth [in 1622 Revels Co.]. |
| Trimalchio, *a humorous gallant*, | Andrew Keyne [in 1622 Palsgrave's Co.]. |
| Agurtes, *an Impostor*, . . | Matthew Smith. |
| Autolicus, *his disciple*, . . | James Sneller [James Kneller in 1624 Children of Revels to late Queen Anne]. |
| Capritio, *a young Novice*, . | Henry Gradwell. |
| Miscellanio, *his Tutor*, . . | Thomas Bond [in 1624 Children of Revels of late Queen Anne]. |

[1] Cf. ii. 358.

| | |
|---|---|
| SNAILE, FIDELIO, *friends to Philautus*, | RICHARD FOWLER [in 1622 Palsgrave's Co.]. EDWARD MAY. |
| JEFFERY, *tenant to Philautus*, | ROBERT HUYT [White]. |
| TRIPHŒNA, *wife to Philautus*, | ROBERT STRATFORD.[1] |
| FAUSTINA, *sister to Philautus*, | RICHARD GODWIN. |
| MILLESCENT, *daughter to Agurtes* | JOHN WRIGHT. |
| MARGERY, *her Maid*, | RICHARD FOUCH. |
| QUARTILLA, *Gentlewoman to Triphœna*, | ARTHUR SAVILL. |
| BAWD, | SAMUELL MANNERY.' |

To this list must be added Joseph More, whose name appears first in the company's licence of Dec. 7, 1631. As he did not act in *Holland's Leaguer*, he no doubt joined the Prince's men in 1631 as their manager, a position he had long held with the Lady Elizabeth's men.[2]

The Prince's men must have moved into Salisbury Court theatre between Jan. 10 and Jan. 26, 1632, for on the latter date *Holland's Leaguer* was entered as 'lately and often acted' by them at Salisbury Court, and on the former date Shirley's *Changes: or Love in a Maze* was licensed for the company of His Majesties Revels at Salisbury Court.[3] The Prince's men most likely came from the Fortune, for many years the home of the Palsgrave's Company.[4] The cause of this exchange of theatres is doubtful. From the Prologue and Epilogue to Shirley's *Changes* it is evident that the Revels company had not been successful at Salisbury Court,

[1] Mr. Fleay reads 'Stafford' (*Stage*, 331).

[2] More must have joined the Prince's men after August 13, 1631, for on that date he appeared at the head of the Lady Elizabeth's company at Reading (cf. ii. 387).

[3] Herbert MS., and title-page of 1632 quarto.

[4] Cf. above, 206 f.

but hoped that Shirley's fame would bring them success. Judging by the reference to them in the Prologue to *Holland's Leaguer*, as 'since made fortunate By more propitious starres,' this was the case, and, if so, may have been the cause of their moving into the Fortune, which, being a public theatre, was no doubt considerably larger than Salisbury Court, a private theatre.[1]

When King Charles set out on a 'progress' to Scotland in May, 1633, the Prince's men accompanied him, for in the Register of the Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery is the following entry :—'25 Aug$^{t}$. 1634. A Council warrant for 100*l* for the Princes Players for their attendance abroad, during the progress of the Court.'[2] As Charles made no progress between July, 1633, when he returned to England,[3] and August, 1634, this entry must refer to the 1633 progress.

During 1634 the Prince's men visited several of the provincial cities. Between March 8 and April 8 they were at Dover; in August at Coventry and Leicester; and in September at Southampton. In the course of the year they also acted three plays at Court, for which payment was made to Joseph More, Andrew Cane, and Ellis Worth on Dec. 10, 1635.

By 1635 the Revels company had returned to Salisbury Court, for Richard Brome's *The Sparagus Garden* was 'acted in the yeare 1635 by the then Company of Revels, at Salisbury Court.'[4] The

[1] Cf. *Sir Gyles Goose-cappe, Knight*, 1636 quarto.
[2] Collier, i. 472 *n*.
[3] Gardiner, vii. 290.
[4] 1640 quarto, title-page.

Prince's men seem to have gone to the Red Bull and the 'Red Bull company' to the Fortune, for in April, 1636, Weeks and Perry, who belonged to the latter company, are mentioned as 'of the company of the Fortune playhouse,'[1] and the Prince's men are known to have played at the Red Bull in 1639-40.[2] Before leaving Salisbury Court the Prince's men had obtained a new licence, for on Nov. 3, 1635, when they visited Norwich, Joseph More presented 'an Instrument signed by his Ma$^{tie}$ & under his Ma$^{ties}$ privie signett authorisinge Andrew Kayne Elis Worth and others to play Comedies in Salisbury Court & otherwhere w$^{th}$in five miles of London And in all other cities, &c.'[3] This cannot be the licence of Dec. 7, 1631, for at that time the Prince's men were acting at the Fortune.

On March 9, 1636, the Prince's men visited Norwich, and presented their licence of Dec. 7, 1631.[4]

[1] Cf. below, 276. Mr. Fleay supposes that in 1633, immediately after the Prince's men returned from Scotland, they occupied the Fortune, the Revels company having gone to Salisbury Court while the Prince's men were absent with the King (*Stage*, 330, 337). This is not impossible, but there is no evidence to show that the Revels company occupied Salisbury Court before 1635. The following entry of October, 1633, in the Herbert MS., refers to the players at Salisbury Court, but does not indicate the company occupying that theatre: 'Exception was taken by Mr. Sewster to the second part of *The City Shuffler*, which gave me occasion to stay the play, till the company had given him satisfaction; which was done next day, and under his hands he did certefye mee that he was satisfyed' (Collier, i. 481 *n.*). Mr. Fleay states that the Prince's men remained at the Fortune till May 12, 1636, when the theatres were closed on account of the plague; and when the theatres re-opened in October, 1637, went to the Red Bull (*Stage*, 340, 358). He does not seem to know that the Mayor of Canterbury spoke of 'Weeks and Perry' who were never Prince Charles II.'s men as Fortune players in April, 1636 (*Cal. State Papers*, 1636).

[2] Cf. below, 223.

[3] Cf. ii. 358.

[4] *Ibid.*

By May 12, the weekly deaths from the plague exceeded forty in London, and the theatres were closed.[1] Not till Feb. 23, 1637, did the plague death-rate fall below forty. The King promptly gave the theatres permission to open, but as by March 2 the plague deaths had jumped to fifty-seven, the theatres were again closed, not to be reopened till Oct. 2.[2] During this time, the companies no doubt travelled considerably, but as the plague also existed in the provinces,[3] they probably found much difficulty in obtaining permission to play. The only provincial appearance of the Prince's men was at Dover, between April 8 and August 8, 1636.

On Jan. 16, 1638, one Thomas Pinnock, a silk-weaver, was committed 'for menacing and threatening to pull downe the Redbull playhouse and strikenge divers people with a great cudgell as he went alonge the streets.'[4] Shortly after this, the Prince's men left London for the provinces, visiting Norwich on Feb. 21, and presenting their licence of Dec. 7, 1631.[5] By August 23, the company must have been back in London, at the Red Bull, for on that

[1] Cf. ii. 188. Already on May 10, 1636, the Privy Council had passed an order for the closing of the theatres (Collier, ii. 9). This Herbert conveyed to the 'four companys of players' on May 12 (Malone by Boswell, iii. 239).

[2] *Ibid.* Malone by Boswell, iii. 239. Herbert gives the number of plague deaths for the week ending February 23, 1637, as forty-four. The plague tables give it as thirty-eight. By August 24, 1637, the weekly plague death-rate fell below forty, and did not rise above that number during the remainder of the year. The authorities, however, were evidently going to run no risks, for they did not allow the theatres to open till October 2.

[3] Creighton, i. 528-529.

[4] *Middlesex County Records*, iii. 168.

[5] Cf. ii. 358.

date Thomas Jacob was charged with 'committinge a greate disorder in the Red Bull playhouse and for assaulting and beating divers persons there.' [1]

On Sept. 29, 1639, an order was issued by the King in Council, commanding that the actors, poet, and licenser of *The Whore New Vamped*, which had been acted at the Red Bull, by the Prince's men, be punished. The objection was that certain words spoken by Andrew Cane libelled the Aldermen and Proctors. What punishment was meted out is not stated.[2]

At Easter, 1640, the Prince's company went to the Fortune, and the Fortune company (*i.e.* the Red Bull-King's Co.) returned to the Red Bull.[3] The reason for this change nowhere appears.

In 1641 Prince Charles's players visited Dover. After this nothing further is heard of this company.

[1] *Middlesex County Records*, iii. 168.

[2] *Cal. State Papers*, September 29, 1637.

[3] Malone by Boswell, iii. 241. In a Prologue upon the removing of the late Fortune Players to the Bull, by J. Tatham, published in *Fancies Theatre*, 1640, occur the following lines :—

'Here gentlemen our anchor's fixt; and we
Disdaining *Fortune's* mutability,
Expect your kind acceptance; then we'll sing,
(Protected by your smiles, our ever-spring,)
As pleasant as if we had still possest
Our lawful portion out of *Fortune's* breast.
Only we would request you to forbear
Your wonted custom, banding tile and pear
Against our *curtains*, to allure us forth :—
I pray, take notice, these are of more worth;
Pure *Naples silk, not worsted.*—We have ne'er
An actor here has mouth enough to tear
Language by the ears. This forlorn hope shall be
By us refin'd from such gross injury;
And then let your judicious loves advance
Us to our merits, them to their ignorance.'

## COURT PERFORMANCES

(Patron, Prince Henry, *d.* Nov. 6, 1612.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1604. Jan. 4, | | (The Prince's players).[1] |
| Jan. 15, | | ( ,, ).[1] |
| Jan. 21, | | ( ,, ).[1] |
| Jan. 22, | | ( ,, ).[1] |
| Feb. 19, | | ( ,, ).[2] |
| Nov. 23, | | ( ,, ).[3] |
| Nov. 24, | | ( ,, ).[3] |
| Dec. 14, | | ( ,, ).[4] |
| Dec. 19, | | ( ,, ).[4] |
| 1605. Jan. 15, | | ( ,, ).[4] |
| Jan. 22, | | ( ,, ).[4] |
| Feb. 5, | | ( ,, ).[4] |
| Feb. 19, | | ( ,, ).[4] |
| 1605-6. *c.* Xmas, | Six plays. | ( ,, ).[5] |
| 1606-7. Dec., Jan., Feb., | Six plays. | ( ,, ).[6] |
| 1607-8. Nov., Dec., Jan., | Four plays. | ( ,, ).[7] |
| 1608-9, | Three plays. | ( ,, ).[8] |
| 1610-11, | Four plays. | ( ,, ).[9] |
| 1611. Dec. 28, | | ( ,, ).[10] |
| Dec. 29, | [*Almanac*]. | ( ,, ).[10] |
| 1612. Feb. 5, | | ( ,, ).[10] |
| Feb. 29, | | ( ,, ).[10] |

(Patron, Frederick v., Elector Palatine of the Rhine, King of Bohemia, 1619, *d.* 1632.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1612-13, | | (The Prince Palatine's players).[11] |

(Patron, Prince Charles, afterwards Charles II.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1634. Sept. and Oct. | Three plays. | (Prince Charles's players).[12] |
| 1635. Jan., Feb., May, | Four plays. | ( ,, ).[12] |
| 1637. Nov., Dec., | Three plays. | ( ,, ).[13] |
| 1639. November, | Three plays. | ( ,, ).[14] |

## NOTES TO COURT PERFORMANCES.

[1] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxv. On February 19, 1604, Edward Alleyn and Edward Juby were paid twenty nobles and given a reward of five marks for a play presented by the Prince's company on January 21, before King James, and sixty nobles for three plays presented before the Prince on January 4, 15, and 22.

[2] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxvii. On April 17, 1604, Edward Juby received for the Prince's company twenty nobles and a reward of five marks, for a performance before King James on 'Shrouemondaye at nighte.'

[3] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxvii. On December 10, 1604, Edward Juby received for the Prince's company £16, 13s. 4d. for two plays, one presented before the Queen on November 23, and the other before the Prince on November 24.

[4] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxvi. On February 22, 1605, Edward Juby received £40 for the Prince's players for the performance of six plays before the Prince, viz. on December 14 and 19, 1604, and January 15 and 22, and February 5 and 19, 1605.

[5] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxviii. On April 30, 1606, Edward Juby, for the Prince's players, was paid for three plays before the King and three before the Prince, receiving 100s. and a reward of 66s. 8d. for each play.

[6] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxviii. On February 28, 1607, Edward Juby received £60 for the Prince's players for six plays performed at Court during December, 1606, and January and February, 1607. Mr. Fleay's reasons for suspecting this entry are inadequate (*Stage*, 172).

[7] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxix. On May 8, 1608, Edward Juby was paid £40 for four plays presented by the Prince's men before the King and Prince at Whitehall in November, December, 1607, and January, 1608.

[8] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxix. On April 5, 1609, Edward Juby was paid £30 for three plays performed by the Prince's men before the King and Prince.

[9] Cunningham, *Revels*, xl. On March 20, 1611, Edward Juby was paid £40 for four plays performed by the Prince's players before the King.

[10] Cunningham, *Revels*, xli-xlii. On June 18, 1612, Edward Juby was paid forty nobles and ten nobles reward for two plays by the Prince's men before the King on December 28 and 29, 1611, and forty nobles for two plays before the Prince on February 5 and 29, 1612. Cunningham in his forged *Book of the Revels* for 1611-12, enters a play called *Almanak*, as played by the Prince's men the Sunday after St. John's day, *i.e.* December 29. As Cunningham seems to have had some genuine basis for these forgeries, it is possible that this entry is genuine. Mr. Fleay conjectures that the *Prince's Mask* was performed by the Prince's players on January 6, 1612 (*Stage*, 178). This is apparently based on the following entry in Cunningham's forged *Book of the Revels* for 1611-12: 'Twelfe night the princes Mask performed by Gentelmen of his High——.' (Cunningham, *Revels*, 211.) Granted that the entry is genuine, it is highly improbable that it refers to professional players.

[11] Cunningham, *Revels*, xlii. On March 31, 1613, Edward Juby was paid £6, 13s. 4d. for a play by the Palatine's men before the Princess Elizabeth.

[12] *Apology*, 509. Chalmers quotes thus from the Chamberlain's Office books: '10th Decmr 1635—A warrant for £100 to the Prince's comedians —viz. £60 for 3 plays acted at Hampton-court at £20 for each play, in September and October, 1634.—And £40, for four plays at Whitehall, and the Cockpit, in January, February, and May following, at £10 for each play.—Mem.—Their bill was signed by Sir Henry Herbert, Joseph Moore, Andrew Kayne and Ellis Worth.' The 'Cockpit' here referred to is the Cockpit in Whitehall (cf. Malone by Boswell, iii. 121; *Stage*, 339). Mr. Fleay who follows Collier's inaccurate notes from the above entry gives only five plays, and does not state where they were acted (cf. *Stage*, 317; Collier, ii. 5).

[13] *Apology*, 510; Collier, ii. 19. Collier thus quotes from the Chamberlain's Office books: '21 March 1637-8. A warrant for 40*l.* unto Joseph Moore, for himself and the rest of the Prince's players, for 3 plays acted before his Highness, etc., in Nov. and Dec. last: one whereof was at Richmond, for which was allowed 20*l.*, in consideration of their travel and remove of goods.'

[14] *Apology*, 511; Collier, ii. 23; *Stage*, 350. Chalmers thus quotes from the Chamberlain's Office books: '4th May 1640—A warrant for £60 unto the company of the Prince's players (viz.) to Joseph Moore and Andrew Kayne for themselves and the rest, for 3 plays by them acted at Richmond, at £20 each play, in consideration of their travelling expences, and loss of the days at home, these in the month of November.—Mem.—Their bill was testified by Mr. Ayton, the Prince's Gent. Usher.'

## PROVINCIAL VISITS

(Patron, Prince Henry, 1594–Nov. 6, 1612.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1604-5. Nov. 2, '04–[Nov.] '05, . | Maidstone. | (Prince Henry's players). |
| | Winchester. | ( ,, ). |
| 1605-6. July 10–Oct. 10, '06, . | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| 1606-7. Oct. 17, '06, . . | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |
| 1607-8. July–Nov., '08, . . | Maidstone. | ( ,, ). |
| July–Oct. 16, '08, . . | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| Oct. 1, '08, . . . . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| 1608-9, . . . . . | Shrewsbury. | ( ,, ). |
| 1609, . . . . . | Hereford. | ( ,, ). |
| 1609-10, . . . . . | Shrewsbury. | ( ,, ). |
| 1610-11. [Oct. or Nov.], 1610, . | Shrewsbury. | ( ,, ). |
| [Oct. or Nov.], 1610. . . | Winchester. | ( ,, ). |

(Patron, Frederick v., the Palsgrave or Elector Palatine of the Rhine, King of Bohemia, 1619, *d.* 1632.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1615-16. July 13, '16, . . | Coventry. | (The Palsgrave's players).[1] |
| 1616-17. *c.* April 19, '17, . . | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| 1617-18. Sept. 29–Dec. 25, '17, . | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |
| 1618-19. . . . . | Winchester. | (The Prince Palatine's players). |
| 1619-20. April 15, '20, . . | Dover. | ('The prince palatine & King of Bohemia his players'). |
| 1620-21. May 24–April 21, '21, | Dover. | (The King of Bohemia's players). |
| 1622. Jan. 13, . . . . | Leicester. | ('The Fortune players'). |
| 1623. May 31, . . . . | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| [1625-6. Bet. April 14–28, '26, . | Dover. | ('His highnes stage players')]. |
| 1630-31. July–Sept., '31, . | Bristol. | (The Palsgrave's players). |

(Patron, Prince Charles, *b.* 1630, May 29, became Charles II. in 1660.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1633-4. March 8–April 8, '34, . | Dover. | (Prince Charles's players). |
| August, '34, . . . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| Aug. 10, '34, . . . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| Sept. 7, '34, . . . | Southampton. | ( ,, ). |
| 1635-6. Nov. 3, '35, . . . | Norwich. | (Salisbury Court players). |
| March 9, '36, . . . | Norwich. | (Andrew Cane's company). |
| April 8–Aug. 8, '36, . . | Dover. | (Prince Charles's players). |
| 1637-8. Feb. 21, '38, . . | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| 1640-1. Aug. 9–Sept. 6, '41, . | Dover. | ( ,, ). |

[1] This item may refer to the Palsgrave's provincial company of *c.* 1615-16 (cf. ii. 4-5).

## IV

## DUKE OF LENOX—DUKE OF ALBANY—DUKE OF YORK—1, 2, PRINCE CHARLES'S COMPANIES

### I

Soon after Queen Elizabeth's death her players seem to have passed under the patronage of Ludovic Stuart, Duke of Lenox.[1] In 1604 the refusal of certain provincial towns to allow these players to act, called forth the following letter from the Duke of Lenox:—

> 'To all maiors, Justeces of peas, Shereefs, Balifes, Constabells, and all other his highnes officers and lofing subjects, to whome it shall, or may in any wise appertaine.
>
> Sir. I am given to understand that you have forbidden the Companye of Players (that call themselves myne) the exercise of their Playes. I praie you to forbeare any such course against them, and seeing they have my License to suffer them to continue the use of their Playes; and untill you receave other signification from me to them, to afforde them your favour and assistance. And so I bidd you hartely farewell. From Hampton Courte, the xiii of October 1604.
>
> Your loving freende,
>
> Lenox.'[2]

[1] Cf. above, 15.

[2] Collier, *Memoirs of Edw. Alleyn*, 69; Warner, *Dul. Coll. MSS.*, 27.

On March 16, 1605, Francis Henslowe, John Garland, and Abraham Saverie are mentioned as members of the Duke of Lenox's company,[1] and the following undated entry in Henslowe's Diary belonging, in all probability, to *c.* 1604-5, adds another name to the list of these players :—

> 'Lent vnto frances henslow to goyne w$^{th}$ owld garlland & symcockes & sauerey when they played in the duckes nam at ther laste goinge owt the some of vij$^{ll}$ J saye Lent. . . .vii$^{ll}$.[2]

In 1606 Francis Henslowe died.[3] The last mention of the Lenox company is at Coventry between Nov. 30, 1607, and March, 1608.

II

A company of players under the patronage of Prince Charles, second son of James I., first appeared in 1608.[4] They were, not improbably, the company which had formerly been known as the

[1] Warner, *Dul. Coll. MSS.*, 28.

[2] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 160. Francis Henslowe and Saverie were not above thieving when occasion offered, as is shown by the following entries in the *Diary* : (1) 'Lent vnto frances henslow t[he]o descharge hime seallfe owt of the whitte Lion from a hatmacker in barmsey strette a bowt his horsse w$^{ch}$ was stolen from hime & he sewed my kynsman at the syes for hime & to macke & end betwext he payd hime fyve pownd w$^{ch}$ J lent hime J saye . . . v$^{ll}$.' (2) 'lent vnto frances henslowe the same tyme to geue vnto the knyghtes mane w$^{ch}$ sewed them for Robinge of his master threepounds & syxshellynges & eyght pence & promesed hime iij$^{ll}$ more w$^{ch}$ saverey mvst paye his parte J saye—iii$^{ll}$ vi$^{s}$ 8$^{d}$.' (*Diary*, ed. Greg, 142.)

[3] Warner, *Dul. Coll. MSS.*, 131-132.

[4] As it is impossible to certainly distinguish Prince Charles's London and provincial companies in the provinces I have treated these companies together. Cf. below, 239 f. Mr. Fleay supposes this company to have come into existence about 1610 (*Stage*, 188).

Duke of Lenox's men.[1] Until the death of his elder brother Henry, Prince Charles was known as the Duke of Albany, the Duke of York, or 'the younger Prince.' After his brother's death on Nov. 6, 1612, he was usually called 'the Prince,' though not formally created Prince of Wales till Nov. 4, 1616. His players appeared under the various titles by which he was known.[2]

This company's first London playing-place seems to have been in Whitechapel, for in the summer of 1608 the Chamberlain of Leicester entered the following payment in his account book :—

> 'Itm given to the Princes players of the White Chapple, London. . . . . xx$^{s}$.[3]

As Prince Henry's men were at this time acting at the Fortune in Golden Lane, St. Giles, without Cripplegate, it cannot refer to them, unless the Chamberlain made some mistake in his entry. There was no known theatre in Whitechapel at this time, so in all probability the reference is to some Inn yard, which Prince Charles's men used till they moved into the Curtain, in the liberty of Halliwell, Shoreditch, most likely about Dec., 1609, or early in 1610.

On March 30, 1610, the Duke of York's players obtained a new Patent permitting them to act 'in and about our Cittye of London, in such usual houses as themselves shall provide,' and also in all provincial towns. The following members of the company are named :—

[1] Cf. below, 231.
[2] Cf. below, 239 f.
[3] Cf. ii. 310.

John Garland.
William Rowley.
Thomas Hobbes.
Robert Dawes.
Joseph Taylor.
John Newton.
Gilbert Reason.[1]

The only one of these men mentioned before this as a member of any dramatic company is John Garland,[2] who in 1605 was in the Duke of Lenox's company.[3] As the last appearance of this company was between Nov., 1607, and March, 1608, and the first appearance of Prince Charles's men was between June and October, 1608, it is very probable that soon after March, 1608, the Duke of Lenox's men passed under the patronage of Prince Charles.[4]

When the Princess Elizabeth's company was formed in April 1611, Joseph Taylor left Prince Charles's men for the new company.[5]

III

In May, 1613, a new company of Prince's men was formed for travelling in the provinces. This company was under the leadership of Gilbert

[1] Shak. Soc. Pub., iv. 47.

[2] Mr. Fleay states that W. Rowley was a Queen Anne's man in 1607 (*Stage*, 375). Apparently his only evidence for this statement is that on June 29, 1607, *The Travels of Three English Brothers*, in which Rowley had a hand, was acted at the Curtain, and so very probably by the Queen's men (Halliwell, *Dictionary*; *Drama*, ii. 277; above, 186 f.). This is slight evidence on which to state that Rowley was acting with the Queen's men, as he might have written part of a play for them, though playing with another company.

[3] Cf. above, 229.

[4] Cf. below, 239.

[5] *Ibid.*, 243.

Reason and William Eaton, and used as their licence a duplicate of the London Prince's men's licence of March 30, 1610, which was dated May 31, 1613.[1]

On July 16, 1616, the Earl of Pembroke issued an order for the suppression of this company. He commanded any of the provincial authorities to whom the company might apply for permission to play, to take their duplicate licence from them and send it to him, and also to order the company to appear before him at Whitehall. On June 24, 1617, Joseph More brought this order to Norwich, and a copy of it was duly placed on record in the Mayor's Court Book.[2] When Reason and his company next appeared in Norwich, on May 31, 1623, and presented their duplicate licence of 1613, they were shown Pembroke's order and refused permission to play, though no attempt seems to have been made to take their licence from them, or to force them to appear at Whitehall.[3] In fact, the probabilities are that Reason was able to satisfy the Norwich authorities that the order of 1616 was no longer in force against his company, for after stating that Reason's duplicate licence was 'crossed' by Pembroke's order of 1616, the clerk adds the following reasons why the company were not to play: 'by reason of the want of worke for the poore & in respect of the contagion feared And for many other Causes.' The company was offered a gratuity, which they refused.

Just when or how Pembroke's order against Reason's company became inoperant is unknown. Almost certainly it was before August 24, 1621, for on that date Reason and his Company played

[1] Cf. ii. 347. [2] *Ibid.*, 343-344. [3] *Ibid.*, 347.

in Coventry and were given a reward of 20s. by the local authorities,[1] who without doubt had seen Pembroke's order, as Coventry was one of the provincial towns most frequented by players. At any rate, by Nov. 20, 1622, Reason's company must have been again in good standing, for Reason was appointed to bear to the provincial towns the Lord Chamberlain's order of that date, 'comandinge to seise all patents that shall not be vnder the seale of office of the Master of the Revells.' When Reason and his company next visited Norwich, on Jan. 29, 1625, they presented this order to the Mayor's Court. On this occasion they were given a reward of 43s., though it is not stated whether or not they were allowed to play.[2]

Before March 27, 1625, this company had probably dispersed, for on that date Reason appeared as a member of the London Prince's company,[3] and there are no subsequent traces of the provincial company.

IV

Meanwhile the London Prince's company, which before 1613 had travelled considerably in the provinces, continued to visit the provincial towns occasionally. Thus on May 18, 1615, the company, of whom John Garland, William Rowley, and Thomas Hobbes are mentioned, visited Norwich and were granted eight days on which to play.[4]

From *c.* 1614 to *c.* 1616 the Prince's men were more or less closely associated in London with the

[1] Cf. ii. 249.
[2] *Ibid.*, 351-352.
[3] Cf. below, 237.
[4] Cf. ii. 340.

Lady Elizabeth's men; *c.* April, 1614, Dawes of the Prince's company joined the Lady Elizabeth's players; on May 31, 1615, Rossiter obtained permission to build a theatre in Blackfriars for the Children of the Revèls, the Prince's players, and the Lady Elizabeth's men, and there was acted N. Field's *Amends for Ladies*, 'both by the Princes seruants, and the Lady Elizabeth's.' [1]

On March 20, 1616, the Prince's men entered into an agreement with Alleyn and Meade, whereby, in discharge of a debt of £400 due to Philip Henslowe, deceased, Alleyn agreed to accept £200, to be paid by daily instalments of a fourth part of the receipts of the 'whole galleryes of the playehowse comonly called the Hope . . . or in anye other howse private or publique wherein they shall playe,' the company also promising to observe all their former articles of agreement with Henslowe and Meade. In this transaction the company was represented by the following members :—

William Rowley.
Robert Pallant.
Joseph Taylor.
Robert Hamlett or Hamlen.
John Newton.
Hugh Ottewell or Attawell.
William Backsted or Barksted.
Thomas Hobbes.
Antony Smith.
William Penn.[2]

[1] Cf. below, 249-250.

[2] Warner, *Dul. Coll. MSS.*, 50 ; Collier, *Memoirs of Edward Alleyn*, 127.

Nine days later, representatives of the various London companies were summoned to appear before the Privy Council on the following Friday [April 5], for playing during Lent, in defiance of the Lord Chamberlain's commandment, conveyed to them by the Master of the Revels. In this affair, William Rowley and John Newton represented the Prince's men, who were among the offending companies. What punishment, if any, was meted out to the players is not recorded.[1]

The Prince's players did not long occupy the Hope. A letter from them to Alleyn states that they had been driven from '[the Hope on] the bankes side,' by Meade, and requests an advance of £40 on the security of 'a great summe of monie,' which they expected from the Court. The letter is signed by the following members of the company :—

William Rowley.
Robert Pallant.
Joseph Taylor.
John Newton.
Robert Hamlett.
Hugh Attawell.
Antony Smith.

It was written in all probability in 1616.[2] The

[1] Collier, i. 380 *n.*

[2] Warner, *Dul. Coll. MSS.*, 52 ; Collier, *Alleyn Papers*, 86. Mr. Fleay dates this letter *c.* February, 1616 (*Stage*, 265), but that it was written before the agreement of March 20, 1616, seems very improbable, for that hypothesis necessitates supposing either that the Prince's men were able on a month's notice to give up the Middlesex theatre they had occupied and return to the Hope, or else that they had no intention of returning to the Hope when they named that theatre in the March 20, 1616, agreement with Alleyn and Meade. After 1616 the Hope seems to have been used only for bear-baiting (Ordish, *Early London Theatres*, 230 f.)

Prince's men, no doubt, had returned to their former theatre, the Curtain, where they are next definitely heard of.[1]

In *The Inner Temple Mask*, or *Mask of Heroes*, by Middleton and Rowley, presented between Jan. 6 and Feb. 2, 1619, several members of the Prince's company took part; William Rowley appeared as Plum Porridge, Joseph Taylor as Dr. Almanac, John Newton as Fasting Day, Hugh Attawell as New Year, and William Carpenter as Time.[2]

During the Christmas festivities of 1621-22, the Prince's men acted at Court three times, presenting on Dec. 27 *The Man in the Moon drinks Claret*, on Dec. 29 *The Witch of Edmonton*,[3] and on Jan. 6 *A Vow and a Good One*.[4] These were the last Court appearances of this company.

Between June 10 and Aug. 19, 1623, the Prince's men moved from the Curtain to the Red Bull, for, on the former date, the Master of the Revels allowed *The Dutch Painter and the French Branke* to be acted by them at the Curtain, and on the latter,

[1] On June 23, 1623, 'a new Play called, *The Duche Painter, and the French Branke*, was allowed to be acted by the Princes Servants, at the Curtayne' (*Supplementary Apology*, 213; *Stage*, 301).

[2] *Stage*, 265; *Drama*, ii. 99.

[3] Cf. ii. 193. This performance shows conclusively that the *Witch of Edmonton* was originally a Prince's play. As the title-page of the 1658 quarto says that it was performed by the Prince's men at the Cockpit, and there is no other evidence of the Prince's ever having acted at the Cockpit, it seems probable that the play passed from the Prince's men to the Cockpit company, *i.e.* Queen Henrietta's men, possibly about 1625, when that company was formed. This conjecture is helped by the fact that of the players mentioned in the quarto, *i.e.* Phen or Fenn, Bird or Bourne, W. Mago, W. Hamlen, Rowland, and Jack, Fenn and Bourne appeared as Queen Henrietta's men, and none of them are traceable to the Prince's company (cf. *Stage*, 306; *Drama*, i. 231).

[4] Malone by Boswell, iii. 147.

*The Peaceable King or the Lord Mendall*, at the Red Bull.[1]

On March 27, 1625, an order for cloaks to wear at the funeral of King James, was issued to this company. In it the following players are named :—

Robert Hamlett.
Antony Smith.
William Rowley.
William Carpenter.
William Penn.
John Newton.
Gilbert Reason.
Thomas Hobbes.[2]

[1] *Supplemental Apology*, 213-214. It is impossible to fix more exactly the date of the Prince's men's removal from the Curtain to the Red Bull. There are two other entries in the Herbert MS. which bear on the subject. They are (1) '1623, 30 July. For the Prince's Players, A French Tragedy of the *Bellman of Paris*, written by Thomas Dekkirs and John Day, for the Company of the Red Bull,' and (2) '1623, August, For the Company at the Curtain ; A Tragedy of *the Plantation of Virginia; the profaneness to be left out*, otherwise not tolerated.' The most obvious reading of these entries is that by July 30, the Prince's men had occupied the Red Bull, and that Herbert was referring to them in the August entry, but for the moment forgot that they had left the Curtain. Of course, it is also possible to suppose that *The Bellman of Paris* was written for the Revels company which had been acting at the Red Bull, but was sold to the Prince's players. In this case the obvious conjecture is that the August entry refers to the Prince's men, and that they did not move into the Red Bull till *c.* August 19. As the apparent cause of the appeal of May 23, 1623, by Worth, Cumber, and Blaney, was the breaking up of the Revels company and their desire to get rid of the payment to Susan Baskervile which the company had agreed to make, it seems probable that the company did not use the Red Bull after May 23 (*Stage*, 273 f.) The last mention of the Revels company in the Herbert MS. is on May 10, 1673. Consequently the Prince's men could move into the Red Bull any time after June 10, when they are last certainly mentioned as playing at the Curtain. Mr. Fleay's statements concerning the occupancy of the Curtain and Red Bull, from May to August, 1623, are conflicting (*Stage*, 265, 272, 299, 300).

[2] *New Shak. Soc. Trans.*, App. ii., 1877-9.

Soon after, when Charles took his father's players, the King's men, under his patronage, Smith, Penn, Hobbes, and possibly other members of his old company, were transferred to the King's men.[1] The remaining players seem to have amalgamated with the former King's provincial company. This new company acted at the Red Bull, and was known in London as the Red Bull company, and in the provinces as the King's company.[2]

[1] Cf. above, 162. [2] Cf. below, 271 f.

## COURT PERFORMANCES

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1610. Feb. 9, . . | | (The Duke of York's players).[1] |
| Dec. 12, . . . | | ( ,, ).[1] |
| Dec. 20, . . . | | ( ,, ).[1] |
| 1611. Jan. 15, . . . | | ( ,, ).[1] |
| 1612. Jan. 12, . . . | | ( ,, ).[2] |
| Jan. 28, . . . | | ( ,, ).[2] |
| Feb. 13, . . . | | ( ,, ).[2] |
| Feb. 18, . . . | | ( ,, ).[2] |
| [Feb. 24, Shrove Monday, . . . | *Hymen's Holiday.* | ( ,, )].[3] |
| 1613. March 2, . . | 1 *Knaves.* | (The Prince's players).[4] |
| March 5, . . . | 2 *Knaves.* | ( ,, ).[4] |
| 1621. Dec. 27, . . | *The Man in the Moon drinks Claret.* | ( ,, ).[5] |
| Dec. 29, . . . | *The Witch of Edmonton.* | ( ,, ).[5] |
| 1622. Jan. 6, . . . | *A Vow and a Good One.* | ( ,, ).[6] |

### NOTES TO COURT PERFORMANCES

[1] Cunningham, *Revels*, xlii. On Jan. 20, 1613, William Rowley was paid £26, 13s. 4d. for four plays performed by the Duke of York's players before Prince Henry, the Duke of York, and the Princess Elizabeth on Feb. 9, 1610, Dec. 12 and 20, 1610, and Jan. 15, 1611. There is nothing to indicate why this payment was so long delayed.

[2] Cunningham, *Revels*, xlii. On June 20, 1612, William Rowley was paid £26, 13s. 4d. for four plays performed by the Duke of York's players before Prince Henry, the Duke of York, and the Princess Elizabeth, on Jan. 12, 28, Feb. 13 and 18, 1612.

[3] Cunningham, *Revels*, 211. This entry is from Cunningham's forged *Revels Book* for 1612. Possibly it is based on a true original (cf. above, 177 *n.* 4).

[4] *Shak. Soc. Papers*, ii. 123; Cunningham, *Revels*, xlii. On June 7, 1613, William Rowley was paid £13, 6s. 8d. for two plays, *The First Part of the Knaves* on March 2, and *The Second Part of the Knaves* on March 5, by the Prince's players before the Count Palatine and Princess Elizabeth.

[5] Cf. ii. 193. On March 6, 1622, the Prince's players were paid 20 marks and given a reward of 20 marks for performing two plays, *i.e. The Man in the Moon drinks Claret*, on Dec. 27, 1621, and *The Witch of Edmonton*, on Dec. 29, 1621. Mr. Fleay does not know of these performances (cf. *Stage*, 258; *Drama*, i. 231, and above, 236).

[6] Malone by Boswell, iii. 147 *n.* 'Upon Twelfe night, the Masque being put off, the play called A Vow and a Good One, was acted by the princes servants.'

## PROVINCIAL VISITS

### I

(The London Company.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1604-5. April 8, '05, . . . | Norwich. | (The Duke of Lenox's players). |
| [After July 19, '05], . . | Coventry. | ( „ ). |
| | Barnstaple. | ( „ ). |
| 1607-8. Nov. 30, '07–[Mar. '08], | Coventry. | ( „ ). |

### II

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1608. Bet. June 1–Aug. 21, . | Leicester. | (Prince's players of the Whitechapel, London). |
| 1608-9. Oct. 1, '08, . . . | Leicester. | (The Duke of Albany's players). |
| Oct. 20, '08, . . . | Ipswich. | (The younger Prince's players). |
| [Oct. '08–Oct. '09, . . | Bath. | ('The Duke's players')]. |
| 1609-10. May 3, '10, . . | Norwich. | (The Duke of Albany's players). |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| July 1, '10, . . . | Leicester. | (The Duke of Albany's players). |
| July, 1610, . . | York. | ( ,, ). |
| 1610-11. April 18, '11, . . | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| 1611, . . . . . | York. | ( ,, ). |

III

(The London and Provincial Companies.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1612-13, . . . . . | Barnstaple. | (The Prince's players). |
| | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |
| 1613-14. Nov. 23, '13–Nov. 16, '14, . . . . | Coventry. | The Duke of Albany's players). |
| Jan. 20, '14, . . . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 23, '13–Nov. 16, '14, . | Coventry. | (The Prince's players). |
| | Barnstaple. | ( ,, ). |
| April 16–May 14, '14, . | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| 1614-15. Nov. 7, '14, . . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 10, '14, . . . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov., '14, . . . . | Nottingham. | ( ,, ). |
| May 18, '15, . . . | Norwich. | (The Prince's London players). |
| | Winchester. | (The Prince's players). |
| | Barnstaple. | ( ,, ). |
| 1615-16. Bet. Mar. 16–Ap. 13, '16, | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| March 30, '16, . . . | Norwich. | (Reason and the Prince's players). |
| Nov. 29, '15–Nov. 27, '16, . | Coventry. | (The Prince's players). |
| Nov. 5, '15–Nov. 4, '16, . | Southampton. | ( ,, ). |
| 1616-17, . . . . | Nottingham. | ( ,, ). |
| May 15, '17, . . . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| | Shrewsbury. | ( ,, ). |
| | Barnstaple. | ( ,, ). |
| July 22, '17, . . . | Marlborough. | ( ,, ). |
| | Southampton. | ( ,, ). |
| Oct. 24, '17, . . . | Exeter. | ( ,, ). |
| 1617-18. July–Sept. 29, '19, . | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |

| | |
|---|---|
| 1618-19. Sept. 28, '19, | Barnstaple. (The Prince's players). |
| | Plymouth. ( ,, ). |
| | Winchester. ( ,, ). |
| Oct. 30, '19, | Londesboro (Craven District). ( ,, ). |
| 1619, | Coventry. ( ,, ). |
| | Leicester. ( ,, ). |
| 1619-20. Bet. May 13–Aug. 5, '20, | Leicester. ( ,, ). |
| After March 9, '20, | Dover. ( ,, ). |
| Aug. 12, '20, | Marlborough. ( ,, ). |
| 1620, | Coventry. ( ,, ). |
| 1620-21. Dec., '20, | Leicester. ( ,, ). |
| Feb. 16, '21, | Nottingham. ( ,, ). |
| Feb. 24–May 24, '21, | Naworth Castle. ( ,, ). |
| | Dover. ( ,, ). |
| | Marlborough. ( ,, ). |
| Aug. 24, '21, | Coventry. (Gilbert Reason and the Prince's players). |
| 1621-22. Nov. 9, '21, | Leicester. (The Prince's players). |
| Sept. 29–Dec. 1, '21, | Dover. ( ,, ). |
| *c.* March 30, '22, | Dover, ( ,, ). |
| Bet. [March]–Aug. 15, '22, | Marlborough. ( ,, ). |
| | Barnstaple. ( ,, ). |
| *c.* end of James I.'s reign, | Bridport. ( ,, ). |
| 1621-22. Aug. 26, '22, | Leicester. ( ,, ). |
| | Norwich. ( ,, ). |
| 1622-23. Dec. 23, '22, | Coventry. (Reason, Eaton, and the Prince's players). |
| Jan. 15, '23, | Stafford. (The Prince's players). |
| May 31, '23, | Norwich. (Reason and the Prince's players). |
| 1623-24. Bet. Ap. 17–May 15, '24, | Dover. (The Prince's players). |
| | Nottingham. ( ,, ). |
| 1624-25. Bet. Oct. 30–Nov. 27, '24, | Dover. ( ,, ). |
| [Nov. 16, '24], | Canterbury. ( ,, ). |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Dec. 23, '24, . . . | Coventry. | (The Prince's players). |
| Jan. 29, '25, . . . | Norwich. | (Reason and the Prince's players). |
| 1625, . . . . . | Leicester. | (The Prince's players). |
| | Winchester. | ( ,, ). |

## V

## 1, 2, 4, PRINCESS ELIZABETH'S COMPANIES[1]

### I

In April, 1611, John Townsend and Joseph Moore seem to have formed a company of players under the patronage of the Princess Elizabeth, then about fifteen years old.[2] On April 27 the company received its licence,[3] and departed almost immediately to play in the provinces, appearing at Ipswich on May 28. By August 29 these men had returned to London, for on that date they gave Henslowe a bond of £500, to perform 'certen articles,' which are unknown. From this bond the following list of the principal members of the company is obtained :—John Townsend, William Barksted or Baxter, Joseph Taylor, William Eccleston, Giles Gary or Carey, Robert Hamlett, Thomas Hunt, Joseph Moore, John Rice, William Carpenter, Thomas Basse, Alexander Foster, and Francis Wambus or Weymus.[4] Backsted or

[1] For 3, Princess Elizabeth's company, cf. ii. 3.

[2] The Princess Elizabeth sometimes took part in the Court Masks. On June 5, 1610, she played in Daniel's *Tethy's Festival*, at Whitehall (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*, xvii. 234). Mr. Fleay dates the Princess Elizabeth's company from Aug. 29, 1611, when they first appeared in London (*Stage*, 186).

[3] Cf. ii. 340.

[4] Among the MSS. at Dulwich College are two copies of this bond, which vary slightly in detail. In the first (*Catalogue of MSS. of Dulwich College*, 239) the list of players is given thus : John Townsend, William Barksted, Joseph Tayler (Taylor), William Egleston (Eccleston), Giles

Baxter and Gary or Carey had joined the company from the 2, Queen's Revels,[1] Joseph Taylor from the Duke of York's,[2] and William Eccleston from the King's players.[3]

During the winter this company performed thrice at Court; once in January, once in February, when they played *The Proud Maid*, and once in March. For these performances Alexander Foster was paid on April 1. In the summer of 1612 they made a provincial tour, visiting Dover, Bath, Coventry, and Leicester. In 1612-13, possibly about Shrovetide, they played twice at Court, receiving payment on June 28, 1613.

Gary, Robert Hamlyn (Hamlen), Thomas Hunte, Joseph Moore, John Rice, William Carpenter, Thomas Basse (Besse ?), and Alexander Foster. The bracketed spellings are those of the signatures. This is the only copy of the bond known to Fleay and Collier, and is printed by the latter in his *Memoirs of Edw. Alleyn*, 98. Mr. Fleay, following Collier's transcript, places Moore after Basse. The second copy of the bond, of the same date as the first, *i.e.* Aug. 29, 1611, gives the list of players as follows :—John Townsend, Joseph Tayler, William Egglestone, Giles Gary, Robert Hamlyn, Thomas Hunte, Joseph Moore, John Rice, William Carpenter, Alexander Foster, Francis Waymus, and Thomas Basse. The document is signed by all the players except G. Gary, and one of the witnesses is John Taylor, perhaps the 'Water-poet' (*Catalogue of MSS. of Dulwich College*, 340). Which of these copies is the final one it is impossible to say. As Backsted and Waymus or Wambus both played subsequently as Lady Elizabeth's men, they were, no doubt, both members of the company when the bond was drawn up. The most probable explanation of the difference in the lists seems to be that shareholders only are mentioned in the bond and either Barksted or Wambus found it impossible, at the last moment, to pay for his share, and so remained with the company as a hired man.

Mr. Fleay's identification of Hamlet, the footman in *Eastward Hoe!* as the actor Robert Hamlyn or Hamlen seems far-fetched. The reference to Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is obviously the reason for so naming the footman. cf. *Stage*, 185; *Drama*, ii. 81, 82.

[1] Cf. below, 358.

[2] Cf. above, 230-231.

[3] *Ibid.*, opp. 172.

II

In March, 1613, the Princess Elizabeth's men, then under the management of Philip Henslowe, and the 2, Queen's Revels, under Philip Rossiter, amalgamated.[1] As there is no mention of a Queen's Revels company in London during the following year, and there are references to the Princess Elizabeth's players, the new company was probably known by the latter name. Some of the actors in this new Princess Elizabeth's company are known from the actor list prefixed to *The Honest Man's Fortune.* These are :—

Nathan Field (from 2, Q. R.).
Joseph Taylor (from 1, P. E.).
Robert Benfield (from 2, Q. R.).
William Eccleston (from 1, P. E.).
Emanuel Read (from 2, Q. R.).
Thomas Basse (from 1, P. E.).[2]

Later lists of the company show that Barkstead or Baxter, John Townsend, and Joseph More were also members of it.

Nathan Field was at the head of the company, and represented them in drawing up their agreement with Henslowe and Jacob Meade, waterman. From this agreement it appears that the contract was for three years, that Henslowe and Meade agreed to 'provide a sufficient house or houses for the said company to play in,' also to furnish the company,

[1] Malone by Boswell, xxi. 416.
[2] Beaumont and Fletcher, 2nd folio, 1679.

whether playing in London or the provinces, with such playing apparel as four or five shareholders, chosen by Henslowe and Meade, should direct. In the case of buying plays the company was to reimburse Henslowe and Meade on the second or third day the play was performed. If the majority of shareholders desired a member of the company to leave it, Henslowe and Meade were to carry out their wishes, if just. Forfeitures arising from any cause were to be paid to the company, minus charges for recovery. Accounts were to be rendered to the company's representative every night.[1]

The men of the 2, Queen's Revels and the 1, Princess Elizabeth's company, who were not included in the 2, Princess Elizabeth's company, seem to have joined forces and travelled under the management of Nicholas Long, calling themselves the Princess Elizabeth's men.[2]

On August 29, 1613, Henslowe and Meade entered into an agreement with Gilbert Katherens, carpenter, 'to pull down the old Bear Garden, "vppon or neere the Banksyde in the saide parishe of St Saviour," and to build by Nov. 30,[3] "one other game place or plaiehouse fitt and convenient in all thinges bothe for players to plaie in and for the game of Beares and bulls to be bayted in the same, and also a fitt and convenient tyre house and a stage to be carryed

[1] Collier, *Memoirs of Edward Alleyn*, 118-119; Warner, *Catalogue of Dulwich MSS.*, 241. The document is not dated, but obviously refers to this Henslowe-Rossiter company.

[2] Cf. ii. 3.

[3] On Sept. 8, 1613, Katherens entered into an agreement with John Browne, bricklayer, about the brickwork of the new theatre (Warner, *Cat. Dul. MSS.*, 241).

or taken awaie and to stand uppon tressels, etc.," the whole to be "of suche large compasse, fforme, widenes and height as the plaie housse called the Swan in the libertie of Parris garden in the saide parishe of St. Saviour now is."'[1] This new theatre was the Hope. In all probability it was finished by the New Year, and occupied by the Princess Elizabeth's men.[2]

[1] Warner, *Cat. Dul. MSS.*, 240; Malone by Boswell, iii. 343; Collier, iii. 99. Apparently in 1613 Henslowe had a public and a private theatre open, for on Dec. 9, 1613, Rob. Daborne wrote to him that he 'hoped that, on receipt of all his papers, he would have pleasured him with 20s., if not upon the play he (Henslowe) has, yet upon the other out of his book which will make as good a play for his "publique howse" as was ever played' (Warner, *Cat. Dul. MSS.*, 45). Mr. Fleay conjectures that the private house referred to was Whitefriars where the 2, Queen's Revels acted 1610-13 (*Stage*, 187, 210). This conjecture is as plausible as any.

[2] Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair* was acted by the Lady Elizabeth's men at the Hope on Oct. 31, 1614. At what theatres or theatre the Princess Elizabeth's men acted before 1614 is uncertain. Middleton's *A Chaste Maid in Cheapside* was acted by them at the Swan. Though the date of the play is doubtful, this performance was probably between 1611 and 1614, because what evidence there is on the subject indicates that after 1614 the Princess Elizabeth's men were at the Hope, Rossiter's Blackfriars, or the Cockpit (cf. below, 248 f.). After the amalgamation of the 1, Princess Elizabeth's and the 2, Queen's Revels in March, 1613, it is doubtful whether the new company occupied the Swan or Whitefriars where the 2, Queen's Revels had been acting. Mr. Fleay's statements concerning the occupancy of the Swan and Whitefriars from 1611 to 1614 are far from consistent. In his account of the amalgamation of the Princess Elizabeth's company and the 2, Queen's Revels, he conjectures that the Princess Elizabeth's men acted at the Swan till March, 1613, and leaves the question open as to whether the new Princess Elizabeth's company used the Swan or Whitefriars after March, 1613 (*Stage*, 186-187). Yet in his *Drama* (ii. 96) he considers that the Princess Elizabeth's players certainly left the Swan in March, 1613, for he states that Middleton's *Chaste Maid in Cheapside*, acted at the Swan by the Princess Elizabeth's servants, must have been produced between August, 1611, and March, 1613, *i.e.* because after March 13 the Princess Elizabeth's men were at Whitefriars (he has here abandoned the theory that the *Proud Maid* of the Court Accounts is the *Chaste Maid in Cheapside*, cf. *Stage*, 186). Further inconsistencies will be found in *Stage*, 202, 204, 252.

Before March, 1614, William Eccleston had left the company[1] to rejoin the King's men.[2]

III

In March or April, 1614, Henslowe made up a new Princess Elizabeth's company (*i.e.* the 4, Lady Elizabeth's company).[3] Many of the old players were included in the new company,[4] the others, probably with some of Long's travelling Princess Elizabeth's company, seem to have formed a new Queen's Revels company which appeared in Coventry on Oct. 7, 1615.[5] Field appears to have remained at the head of the new Princess Elizabeth's company.[6] Into this company *c.* April, 1614, were taken Robert Pallant from the King's and Robert Dawes from Prince Charles's companies.[7] The com-

[1] Malone by Boswell, xxi. 417.

[2] Cf. King's men, *Bonduca* list, above, opp. 172.

[3] Malone by Boswell, xxi. 417; Collier, *Alleyn Papers*, 75-81. The 'Articles of Oppression' give the date of the formation of the new company as March, 1614, and state that Dawes and Pallant joined the company the following June. On the other hand, Dawes's 'Players Articles' imply that he joined the company in April, 1614. As Henslowe's agreements with the company and Dawes are both for three years, it would seem to indicate that the formation of the new company and the inclusion in it of Dawes and Pallant were about the same time, most likely March or April, 1614. Pallant was negotiating with Henslowe before March 28, 1614. (Warner, *Cat. Dul. MSS.*, 47.)

[4] Cf. later lists of the company.

[5] Cf. below, 360-361.

[6] Malone by Boswell, xxi. 418; Warner, *Cat. Dul. MSS.*, 48.

[7] Malone by Boswell, xxi. 416-418; Collier, *Alleyn Papers*, 75-81; above, *n.* 3. Apparently on the fact that Dawes joined the Princess Elizabeth's company from the Prince's in April, 1614, and the association of these companies in London during the following two years, Mr. Fleay bases his statement that the 1614 Princess Elizabeth's company was formed out of the former Princess Elizabeth's company and Prince Charles's company (*Stage*, 187, 188, 263; *Drama*, i. 201). All that the evidence shows, however, is that the Princess Elizabeth's and the Prince's companies were more or less associated in their London theatrical ventures from *c.* 1614 to 1616.

pany continued to act at the Hope, where on Oct. 31, 1614, they played Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair*. This company seems to have been a very capable one, for in 1614, Taylor, the water-poet, wrote concerning them :—

> 'Such a company, I'll boldly say,
> That better (nor the like) e'er play'd a play.'[1]

About February, 1615, Henslowe 'broke' this company by withdrawing the hired men. His reason for doing this was that if the company once got out of his debt, he would lose control of them.[2]

The dissatisfaction of the London Princess Elizabeth's company with Henslowe's treatment of them, was the probable cause of their attempting in 1615 to obtain a new theatre, over which he would have no control. On May 31, 1615, Philip Rossiter, Master of the 'Children of the Revels to the Queene,' obtained permission to build a theatre near 'Puddlewharfe,' in Blackfriars, to be used by the Children of the Revels, the Prince's players, and the Princess Elizabeth's men.[3] Complaint having been made by the Mayor and Aldermen of London that the new theatre would interfere with the proper government of the city, and especially with divine service on week days, Lord Chief-Justice Coke examined Rossiter's Patent, and decided that it only permitted the building of a playhouse without the city; consequently he ordered work at Puddlewharf to

[1] Quoted, Warner, *Cat. Dul. MSS.*, 51 *n.*

[2] Malone by Boswell, xxi. 419. Henslowe's reason is sufficient evidence of the company's prosperity.

[3] Collier, i. 381-382. Mr. Fleay unjustly suspects the authenticity of this document (*Stage*, 263), cf. below, 361.

cease on pain of imprisonment.[1] Rossiter seems to have paid no attention to this order, for on Jan. 26, 1616-7 [1616],[2] the Privy Council wrote to the Mayor, stating that the King had heard that in spite of the above prohibition, Rossiter had 'lately erected and made fit a building which is almost if not fully finished.' The Council ordered the building pulled down so as to be unfit to play in.[3] The theatre must have been fit to act in before it was pulled down, for Nathaniel Field's *Amends for Ladies* was 'acted at the Blacke-Fryers, both by the Princes seruants, and the Lady Elizabeth's.'[4]

Whether or not the Princess Elizabeth's company acted at the Hope after February, 1615, is doubtful. At any rate, by *c.* Feb., 1616, they must have ceased acting at that theatre and separated from the Prince's company, for a letter of that date from the company which had been acting at the Hope, to Edward Alleyn, complaining that Meade, Henslowe's partner, had driven them from the Hope, is signed by the Prince's and not by the Lady Elizabeth's men.[5] The agreement between the company which

[1] Malone by Boswell, iii. 493.

[2] This date seems like a mistake for 1616. That it should take from May, 1615, to January, 1617, to build the new Blackfriars theatre seems incredible, especially as we know that in September, 1615, the work was in progress (Malone by Boswell, iii. 493). Gilbert Katherens agreed on August 29, 1613, to complete the Hope for Henslowe by November 30, 1613 (Warner, *Cat. Dul. MSS.*, 240). There seems to be no reason why the new Blackfriars should have taken longer to build than the Hope.

[3] Malone by Boswell, iii. 494.

[4] Title-page, 1618, 4to. This statement cannot refer to the Blackfriars private theatre used by the King's men. They would not be likely to give up their theatre to a rival company.

[5] Warner, *Dul. Coll. MSS.*, 52; Collier, *Alleyn Papers*, 86-87. The fact that the names of John Townsend, Joseph More, and Anthony Turner do not appear in this list shows that the company was not the Princess Eliza-

had been acting at the Hope under Henslowe's and Meade's management, and Edward Alleyn and Jacob Meade on March 20, 1616, is also signed by the Prince's company only.[1]

During June and July, 1616, the Princess Elizabeth's company travelled in the provinces. On June 5 they visited Norwich, but were not allowed to play, though Townsend presented their licence of April 27, 1611. The Mayor's Court, however, ordered 'an extraordynary gratificacion' of forty shillings to be sent to them at their inn, the White Horse in 'Tombeland.'[2] On July 1 they appeared at Leicester, and about the same time at Coventry.

On July 16, 1616, the Earl of Pembroke issued an order calculated to stop the London companies sending out provincial companies with exemplifications, or duplicate licences. The order states that there were at the time of issue two such Queen's companies, one Prince's company, one Children of His Majesty's Revels company, and one Prince Palatine's company. The provincial authorities were ordered to take the duplicate licences from these companies and forward them to London, also to take sufficient bonds of the players for their

beth's. The letter, though undated, was obviously written shortly after Henslowe's death, during the cold winter of 1615-6, and before March 20, 1616, when the Prince's company entered into a new agreement with Alleyn and Meade. Mr. Fleay's statements concerning the relations of the Prince's and Lady Elizabeth's companies during 1616-7 are not clear (*Stage*, 264, 265, 300, 309).

[1] Warner, *Cat. Dul. MSS.*, 50-51; Collier, *Memoirs of Edw. Alleyn*, 127-130.

[2] Cf. ii. 341-342. That this company presented the licence of 1611, and not a duplicate of it, shows that it was the Princess Elizabeth's London company; cf. also below, 252.

appearance before Pembroke at Whitehall.[1] As no such Princess Elizabeth's company is mentioned, and Joseph More was chosen to carry this order to the various provincial towns, it is pretty certain that before this time the Princess Elizabeth's provincial company had been disbanded.

Where the Princess Elizabeth's players acted in London after the demolition of Rossiter's Blackfriars, about Jan. 26, 1616-7 [1616], is uncertain. In 1622 they are spoken of as the players of the Cockpit or Phœnix.[2] In all probability they occupied that theatre after the Queen's men left it, *i.e.* by 1619 at the latest.[3]

On March 14, 1617, James I. started on a progress to Scotland.[4] In his train were the Children of the Chapel and the Princess Elizabeth's players. During the journey the latter company performed three times, for which they were paid £30 at Whitehall, on July 11.[5] On March 20 James granted the company a new licence, 'signed by his Ma^tie and vnder his privie signet.' This licence mentions Alexander Foster, John Townsend, Joseph Moore, and Francis Wambus as members of the company, authorises them to play in London, and 'by the space of xiii^en dayes at any one tyme in the yeare in any other citty,' and expressly mentions 'that there shalbe but one company as servants to the Lady

[1] Cf. ii. 343-344. [2] Malone by Boswell, iii. 59.

[3] Cf. above, 195-196. Mr. Fleay states positively that on March 4, 1617, when the apprentices partly demolished the Cockpit, the Princess Elizabeth's company was acting there. He offers no evidence to justify this certainty (*Stage*, 264). It is much more probable that the Queen's company was at the Cockpit at the time.

[4] Nichols, *Progresses*, iii. 255. [5] Cunningham, *Revels*, xliv.

Elizabeth lycensed or pmitted to play.'[1] In all probability the Lady Elizabeth's players did not enter Scotland with the King in May, for Weldon, in his satiric account of the Scottish hatred of plays and singing-men, mentions only the Children of the Chapel.[2] On June 4 Joseph Moore seems to have brought Pembroke's order commanding the dispersion of the provincial Queen's, Revels, Prince's and Prince Palatine's companies and the confiscation of their duplicate licences, to Norwich.[3] The Lady Elizabeth's company reached Norwich on June 7, craved permission to play, and presented by Henry Sebeck, a hitherto unmentioned member of the company, their old licence of April 27, 1611. They were allowed to play for three days.[4] Probably about the same time they visited Nottingham. By July 11 they had returned to London.[5] During November and December they were again in the provinces, visiting Marlborough, Coventry, and Exeter.

During 1618 and 1619 they frequently acted in the provinces, visiting Leicester, Norwich (2), Dover, Winchester, Plymouth, and Coventry. At Norwich, on May 23, 1618, they presented their licence of March 20, 1617, and were allowed to play for one

[1] Cf. ii. 344-345.

[2] Nichols, *Progresses*, iii. 338 f. Mr. Fleay makes contradictory statements about the Lady Elizabeth's men while in the train of James on his Scotch Journey. He says, 'the players who were the Lady Elizabeth's men were called in Scotland by their old name, "The Children of the Chapel"' (*Stage*, 178). In another place, 'He (*i.e.* James I.) took with him, not the King's but the L. Elizabeth's men, who were paid for their performances on 11th July. He returned 15th September. He also took with him the Children of the Chapel, to the great offence of the Scots, but only as singing-boys, not as players' (*Stage*, 309). The first of these statements is undoubtedly wrong.

[3] Cf. ii. 343-344. [4] *Ibid.*, 344-345. [5] Cunningham, *Revels*, xliv.

week on condition that they would 'not come agayne to play duringe this whole yeare.'[1] At Plymouth it is stated that the company numbered twenty persons, and were licensed to play 'as well by night as by day.'[2] When the company again visited Norwich on Feb. 8, 1619 (?), Joseph More presented the old licence of April 1611.[3]

After November 4, 1619, when the Princess Elizabeth became the Queen of Bohemia, her players sometimes appeared under her new title.[4]

On April 22, 1620, the Lady Elizabeth's men visited Norwich. They presented their licence of March 20, 1617. Wambus at that time stated that Moore, though still a member of the company, had not played with them for a year, but kept an inn at Chichester. They were allowed to play during the first four days in May, and were given a reward, Townsend, apparently, receiving it for the company.[5] During the winter and spring of 1620-21 they visited Bristol, Coventry, Leicester (twice), Nottingham (with the King's company), and Marlborough. On May 2, 1621, Townsend appeared before the Mayor's Court at Norwich, presented the licence of March 20, 1617, and asked leave for his company to play. But because Townsend was the only member of the company in the town, and letters had lately been received for musters, and 'that the businesses for Subsedyes and other matters of Importance' were 'not yet fully dispatched,' the Court refused his request.[6] Probably the company was playing in

[1] Cf. ii. 344-345.
[2] *Ibid.*, 385.
[3] *Ibid.*, 345.
[4] Cf. below, 261.
[5] Cf. ii. 345.
[6] *Ibid.*, 346.

some neighbouring town, and doubting their reception in Norwich had sent Townsend to find out if they might play there.

On March 13, 1622, a bill, the nature of which is uncertain, was signed by the Lord Chamberlain for John Townsend, Alexander Foster, Joseph Moore, and Francis Wambus, 'the Lady Elizabeths graces her players.'[1] Before this, most of the company must have left London for the provinces, because on March 15 the Lady Elizabeth's players visited Leicester and received a reward from the city, though not permitted to play. On May 1 the company visited Norwich, and Townsend presented a licence allowing them to play in any city for fourteen days.[2] This was probably the licence of March 20, 1621.[3] They were not allowed to play, but were given a reward. During the year they also played at Marlborough. A partial list of the company in 1622, before July 8, is given in the office-book of Sir Henry Herbert. The following players are mentioned as 'the chiefe of them at the Phœnix':—

Christopher Beeston.
Joseph Moore.
Elliard Swanston.
Andrew Cane.
Curtis Greville.
William Sherlock.
Antony Turner.[4]

Christopher Beeston must have joined the Princess Elizabeth's company between May 13, 1619, and

[1] Cf. ii. 193. [2] *Ibid.*, 346. [3] *Ibid.*, 346-347.
[4] Malone by Boswell, iii. 59-60.

July 8, 1622, as on the former date he was acting with the Queen Anne-Revels company, and by July 8, 1622, had left them.[1]

During 1622-3 the Lady Elizabeth's men visited Barnstaple. On January 24, 1623, they were at Coventry, and on January 25, at Leicester. On May 10 they reached Norwich, and Francis Wambus showed to the Mayor's Court of that city a Patent 'signed by his Ma^tie vnder his highnes privie Signet dated the 20th of March, 1621,' licensing John Townsend, Alexander Foster, Joseph Moore, Francis Wambus, and their fellows to play fourteen days a year in any provincial city. They were allowed to play four days in the following week.[2] On Oct. 13 the company appeared at Leicester. By November 5 they had returned to London, for on that day they acted *The Gipsy* before the Prince at Whitehall. On St. John's night, *i.e.* Dec. 27, they presented *The Bondman* before the Prince at Whitehall. On this occasion they were called the 'Queene [of Bohemia's] company.'

On March 20, 1624, the Lady Elizabeth's men played at Dover. Their credentials were 'his Ma^ts

[1] Cf. above, 198. Mr. Fleay considers that, between these dates, Thomas Heywood also left the Queen Anne-Revels company and joined the Lady Elizabeth's men (*Stage*, 273; *Drama*, i. 296). The only evidence for this opinion is, that on Sept. 3, 1624, Heywood's play, *The Captives*, was produced by the Cockpit company (*Herbert MS.*, *Stage*, 304). As the Lady Elizabeth's men were probably acting at the Cockpit at that time, Fleay deduces that Heywood was acting with that company. But Heywood is not mentioned in any list of the Lady Elizabeth's men, and the fact that they acted one play of his about this time is insufficient evidence to connect him with them as an actor. After 1619, Heywood is not mentioned as an actor. In 1624 he seems to have been in the service of the Earl of Worcester, to whom he dedicated his *Nine Books of Women* (Ward, ii. 552).

[2] Cf. ii. 346-347.

lycence, & ye m^r^ of Revells his confirmation.'[1] They seem to have proceeded through the south of England to Lyme Regis, and thence gone north to Norwich, where they appeared on Saturday, April 24. When Wambus presented to the Mayor's Court the company's licence of March 20, 1621, he was confronted with a letter of May 27, 1623, from the Privy Council to the Mayor and Justices of Norwich authorizing and requiring them 'not to suffer any companies of players, tumblers, or the like sort of persons to act any plays or to shew or exercise any other feats and devices' within the city till further order from the Council.[2] Wambus refused to acknowledge the authority of this letter, and departed saying that he would play, and, if necessary, lie in prison a twelvemonth to 'try whether the king's comand or the Counsells be the greater.'[3] Accordingly, on Monday, one Wakefield called the Mayor's attention to the following notice which he had found fastened on the gate 'of the house of Thomas Marcon beinge the Signe of the White horse nere Tomeland':—'Here w^th^in this place at one of the clocke shalbe acted an excellent new comedy called the Spanishe Contract By the Princesse servants vivat Rex.' Hereupon the Mayor sent an officer, Henry Paman, to summon Townsend, Foster, Moore, and Wambus to appear before the Court. Paman, however, could only get speech with Wambus, who acknowledged writing the notice, and asserted that he would play. On being brought before the Mayor Wambus accused him of slighting the king's authority. He was then asked to find

[1] Cf. ii. 266. [2] *Ibid.*, 359-360. [3] *Ibid.*, 348.

security for his good behaviour. This he refused to do, and was committed to prison. Here Wambus lay till May 24, when the Mayor seems to have decided to set him free without bond for his appearance at the next Court Sessions at Michaelmas. This being announced to Wambus, he desired time for deliberation till 'the comeinge of his fellowe Towneshend w^ch^ should be this afternoone.' The result of this deliberation must have been to accept Mr. Mayor's terms, for on May 26 a warrant was sent to the gaoler to discharge Francis Wambus and William Bee,[1] apparently another member of the company who had been imprisoned with Wambus. The gaoler accordingly set Wambus and Bee at liberty, after Townsend had promised to pay all their charges. However, Townsend and Wambus were not satisfied to let the matter rest here; they proceeded to London, and in June obtained a letter from Sir Henry Herbert, 'purporting that yt was my Lo: chamblyns pleasure that he [*i.e.* Wambus] should be set at liberty And should give his owne security for payment of his chardges in the beginning of August followinge.' On the strength of this letter Townsend and Wambus appeared before the Mayor's Court of Norwich in September and desired that the charges they had been put to by the imprisonment of Wambus should be returned to them. The Court decided that no recompense should be given them, and so the incident closed.[2] Early in July the company acted at Coventry and Leicester, and probably about the same time at Nottingham.

From the MS. of *The Captives*, acted *c.* Sept. 3,

[1] Cf. ii. 350. Possibly William Beeston.

[2] Cf. ii. 350.

1624, we obtain the names of two of the minor actors at the Cockpit, and so in all probability of the Lady Elizabeth's company, Gibson, who appeared as a factor (v. 1), and 'stage Taylor' (iii. 2).[1]

This company probably continued to act at the Cockpit till *c.* May, 1625, when the plague deaths in London rose to above forty a week,[2] and playing ceased in the city. When, most likely about June, the new Queen Henrietta's company was formed, the Lady Elizabeth's men lost Antony Turner, William Sherlock, Christopher Beeston, and possibly others to the new company.[3] Upon the reopening of the theatres, *c.* Dec. 1, the Cockpit was occupied by Queen Henrietta's company. Where the Lady Elizabeth's men acted in London after Dec. 1 is not known.

On Dec. 9, 1628, a new licence was granted to the Lady Elizabeth's company. It allowed Joseph Moore, Alexander Foster, Robert Guilman, and John Townsend, 'to practise the playing of comedies, histories, tragedies, and interludes, in and about the city of London, or any other place they shall think fitting.'[4]

On June 27, 1629, Ellis Guest, calling himself one of the company of Joseph More, Alexander Foster, Robert Guilman, and John Townsend, *i.e.*

[1] Bullen, *Old Plays*, 1882-1885, iv.

[2] Cf. ii. 187.

[3] Cf. below, 265.

[4] *Cal. State Papers*, 1628-9, 406; also quoted Collier, i. 449, omitting Foster's name. This mistake is followed by Mr. Fleay (*Stage*, 332). Though the licence as quoted in the *Cal. State Papers* reads 'Joseph' Townsend, there can be no doubt that John Townsend is meant, as the licence was copied into the Reading Records on Dec. 24, 1629, and the clerk entered the name as John Townsend (cf. ii. 386).

the Lady Elizabeth's company,[1] presented at Norwich a 'warrant signed w$^{th}$ his ma$^{ties}$ privie signett & a lycence from the M$^{r}$ of the Revells,' dated June 8, 1629. Guest affirmed that the rest of his company were at Thetford, and consented to accept a gratuity of 40s., which the Mayor's Court offered him, and not to play.[2] As Guest is nowhere else connected with the Lady Elizabeth's men, and Guest and company, and Moore and company are entered in 1629 in the Leicester accounts as two separate companies, and there is no further clue to a licence of the above date belonging to the Lady Elizabeth's men, there can be little doubt, either that the licence presented by Guest was a false one, or that the Norwich clerk made a mistake in his entry.

The Lady Elizabeth's men appeared at Reading on Dec. 24, 1629, and presented their licence of Dec., 1628, but were not allowed to play. On March 3, 1630, they were at Norwich,[3] playing for two days, and in June they visited Coventry, but did not play.[4] During 1630 and 1631 they also visited Leicester, Coventry, and Reading, and in June, 1632, Doncaster. As there are no references to this company after 1632 they probably disbanded in that year.

[1] The entry in the Norwich Court Book describes the company as 'sworne servants to the king.' This was undoubtedly because of the King's signature to their warrant. Their real title was the Lady Elizabeth's men.

[2] Cf. ii. 353.

[3] Both at Reading and Norwich the licence presented was dated Dec. 15, 1628. No doubt the reference is to the licence of Dec. 9, 1628 (cf. *Cal. State Papers*, 1628-9).

[4] At Coventry the company were called 'sworne servants to the king.'

# COURT PERFORMANCES

## I

(1, Lady Elizabeth's Company.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1612. January, . . | | (The Lady Elizabeth's players).[1] |
| Feb. 25, . . . | *The Prowde Mayde.* | ( „ ).[2] |
| March, . . . | | ( „ ).[1] |
| Oct. 20, . . | | ( „ ).[3] |
| 1612-13, . . . | Two plays. | ( „ ).[4] |

## II

(2, Lady Elizabeth's Company.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1613. Dec. 12, . . | *The Dutch Courtesan.* | (The Lady Elizabeth's players).[5] |
| 1614. Jan. 25, . . . | *Eastward Ho!* | ( „ ).[5] |

## III

(4, Lady Elizabeth's Company.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1614. Nov. 1, . . . | *Bartholomew Fair.* | (The Lady Elizabeth's players).[6] |
| 1617. [March–May], . . | Three plays. | ( „ ).[7] |
| 1623. Nov. 5, . . . | *The Gipsy.* | (The Cockpit company).[8] |
| Dec. 27, . . . | *The Bondman.* | (The Queen [of Bohemia's] company).[9] |
| 1624. Jan. 4, . . . | *The Changeling.* | (The Queen of Bohemia's company).[10] |
| Dec. 28, . . . | *Cupid's Revenge.* | ( „ ).[11] |
| 1625. Jan. 6, . . . | *Tu Quoque.* | ( „ ).[12] |

## NOTES TO COURT PERFORMANCES.

[1] Cunningham, *Revels*, xl. On April 1, Alex. Foster was paid £13, 6s. 8d. for the plays presented in January and March before the Prince and Lady Elizabeth.

[2] Cunningham, *Revels*, xl. On April 1, 1612, Alex. Foster was paid 20 nobles and 5 marks (£10) for this performance before the King on 'Shrovetewsday laste at night.' There is no evidence to show that 'the prowde mayde' had any connection with Beaumont and Fletcher's *The Maid's Tragedy*, as Cunningham (*Revels*, xl *n.*) and Halliwell-Phillipps (*Dict. Old Eng. Plays*, 202) supposed (cf. Fleay, *Drama*, i. 192, ii. 328).

[3] Nichols, *Progresses*, ii. 466. It seems hardly likely that this was one of the plays paid for on June 28, 1613 (cf. below). The play was acted before the Lady Elizabeth and the Palsgrave.

[4] Cunningham, *Revels*, xliii. Joseph Taylor was paid £13, 6s. 8d. on June 28, 1613, for two plays presented by the Lady Elizabeth's men before the Prince, the Count Palatine, and the Lady Elizabeth. Mr. Fleay conjectures that these plays were *Cockledemay* (this he supposes to be Marston's *Dutch Courtesan*) and *Raymond, Duke of Lyons* (*Stage*, 175 ; *Drama*, ii. 328). On what evidence he bases these conjectures nowhere appears.

[5] Cunningham, *Revels*, xliv. On June 21, 1614, Joseph Taylor was paid £6, 13s. 4d. for the performance of the *Dutch Courtesan*, and £6, 13s. 4d. and a reward of £2, 0s. 8d. for *Eastward Ho!* The first performance was before the Prince, the second before the King.

[6] Cunningham, *Revels*, xliv ; also above, 247 *n.* On June 11, 1615, Nathan Field was paid £10 for the performance of *Bartholomew Fair* before the King.

[7] Cunningham, *Revels*, xliv. On July 11, 1617, John Townsend and Joseph Moore were paid £30 for the performance of three plays before the King during his journey to Scotland (cf. above, 252).

[8] Malone by Boswell, iii. 227. Performance at Whitehall before the Prince.

[9] Malone by Boswell, iii. 227. Performance at Whitehall before the Prince on 'St. John's night.'

[10] Malone by Boswell, iii. 227. At Whitehall before the Prince.

[11] Malone by Boswell, iii. 228. At Whitehall on 'Innocents night' before the [Prince] and the Duke of Brunswick.

[12] Malone by Boswell, iii. 228. At Whitehall on 'Twelve night' before the Prince.

## PROVINCIAL VISITS

### I

(Patroness, Princess Elizabeth, b. 1596; married Frederick, Elector Palatine of the Rhine, 1613; Queen of Bohemia, 1619–1623; *d.* Feb. 13, 1662. 1, Company.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1610-11. May 28, 1611, . . | Ipswich. | (Lady Elizabeth's players). |
| 1611-12. May 9–June 6, '12, . | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| Oct. 16, '11–Oct. 12, '12, . | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 27, '11–Nov. 25, '12, . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| July 30, '12, . . . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |

### II

(4, Company.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1615-16. June 5, '16, . . | Norwich. | (Lady Elizabeth's players). |
| July 1, '16, . . . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| [*c.* July], '16, . . . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| 1616-17. June 7, '17, . . | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| | Nottingham. | ( ,, ). |
| 1617-18. Nov. 25, '17, . . | Marlborough. | ( ,, ). |
| [Dec. 12, '17], . . . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| [Dec. 13, '17], . . . | Exeter. | ( ,, ).[1] |
| Feb. 22, '18, . . . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| May 23, '18, . . . | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| 1617-18. May 16–June 12, '18, | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| 1618-19, . . . . . | Winchester. | ( ,, ). |
| | Plymouth. | ( ,, ). |
| Jan. 4, '19, . . . . | Coventry, | ( ,, ). |
| 1619-20. Feb. 8, '20, . . | Norwich, | ( ,, ). |
| April 22, '20, . . . | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| 1620-21. [*c.* Dec.], 1620, . . | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |
| Jan. 5, '21, . . . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| Feb. 20, '21, . . . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| April 9, '21, . . . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| April, '21, . . . . | Nottingham. | ( ,, ). |

[1] The date of the visit to Exeter or Coventry must, of course, be wrong, unless the company had divided, a very improbable thing after 1616 (cf. above, 252).

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| May 2, '21, . . . | Norwich. | (Townsend for the Lady Elizabeth's players). |
| | Marlborough. | (Lady Elizabeth's players). |
| 1621-22. March 15, '22, . . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| May 1, '22, . . . | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| [Before Aug. 15, '22], . . | Marlborough. | ( ,, ). |
| 1622-23, . . . . . | Barnstaple. | ( ,, ). |
| Jan. 24, '23, . . . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| Jan. 25, '23, . . . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| May 10, '23, . . . | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| 1623-24. Oct. 13, '23, . . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| March 20, '24, . . . | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| '24, . . . . . | Lyme Regis. | ( ,, ). |
| April 24, '24, . . . | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| July, '24, . . . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| July 9, '24, . . . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| | Nottingham. | ( ,, ). |
| 1629, . . . . . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| 1629-30, Dec. 24, '29, . . | Reading. | (' sworne servants to his Majesty '). |
| March 3, '30, . . . | Norwich. | (Lady Elizabeth's servants). |
| June, '30, . . . . | Coventry. | (' sworne servants to the King '). |
| 1630, . . . . . | Leicester. | (Lady Elizabeth's players). |
| 1630-31. March 30, '31, . . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| Aug. 13, '31, . . . | Reading. | ( ,, ). |
| 1631-32. June 18, '32, . . | Doncaster. | ( ,, ). |

## VI

## 1, QUEEN HENRIETTA'S COMPANY[1]

On March 27, 1625, Charles I. came to the throne, and on June 24 he issued a Patent to his father's players, taking them under his patronage.[2] Probably about the same time a new company was formed under the patronage of Queen Henrietta. When the theatres, which had been closed from May till the last of November on account of the plague,[3] reopened, these men no doubt occupied the Cockpit, with which theatre they were connected till 1637.[4] They were, however, on December 6, ordered to stop playing, because the Cockpit was 'next to his Majesties Courte at Whitehall.'[5] In all probability this prohibition was soon removed, for by the week ending December 24, no plague deaths were recorded in London.[6] This Queen's company was under the management of Christopher Beeston,[7] and included Antony Turner, William Sherlock, and probably others of the Lady Elizabeth's company,[8] John Blaney of the 1623 Revels

[1] For 2, Queen Henrietta's company, cf. ii. 101 f.
[2] Cf. above, 161.
[3] Cf. ii. 187.
[4] Cf. below, 266 f.
[5] *Middlesex County Records*, iii. 6.
[6] Cf. ii. 187.
[7] Cf. below, 269-270, *n.* 2, 6, 7.
[8] Cf. above, 259, and below, lists. Mr. Fleay supposes that Queen Henrietta's company was a continuation of the Lady Elizabeth's company (*Stage*,

company,[1] and Richard Perkins of the late King James's company.[2] Between Oct., 1625, and May, 1626, William Robinson, who seems to have played with Slater's provincial 'late Queen Anne's' company after 1623, joined Queen Henrietta's men, for on the former date he appeared with Slater's men at Coventry,[3] and on the latter with Queen Henrietta's players.

From 1626 to 1635 there are several lists of this company prefixed to various plays they performed. The dating of these lists, with the exception of those in Shirley's *Wedding*, and Nabbes's *Hannibal and Scipio*, is more or less conjectural. It depends largely on the theory that in 1629, when the new King's Revels company was formed, John Young and Timothy Read joined that company from the Queen's men, and that between 1630 and March, 1635, Christopher Goad and William Wilbraham followed their example, while soon after March, 1635, George Stutfield left the King's Revels for the Queen's company.[4] According to Trueman in *Historia Histrionica*: 'Those of principal note at the Cock-pit [*i.e.* before 1642], were Perkins, Michael Bowyer, Sumner, William Allen, and Bird [Bourne], eminent actors, and Robins[on], a comedian.'

321). In one sense it was, as it included some of the players of that company and took over their theatre, but the remains of the old Lady Elizabeth's company existed after 1625, and were often mentioned in the provinces till 1631-2. They also held a London licence from 1628 (cf. above, 259 f.).

[1] Cf. above, 199-200. [2] Cf. below, table. [3] Cf. above, 188.

[4] The basis of this theory is a comparison of the lists of Queen Henrietta's men from 1626 to 1635, with that of the King's Revels for 1635, found in the Norwich records (cf. ii. 356; below, 279 f.). The 1635 list of the King's Revels is unknown to Mr. Fleay.

| Shirley's *Wedding*. c. May 31, 1626. By Queen Henrietta's men.[1] | | Davenport's *King John and Matilda*. [c. 1629][3] 'As it was Acted with great Applause by her Majesties Servants at the Cock-pit in Drury lane.' | | Massinger's *Renegado*. Pr. March 1630.[4] 'As it hath beene often acted by the Queenes Majesties Servants, at the private Playhouse in Drurye-Lane.' | | Heywood's 1, 2, *The Fair Maid of the West*. [c. Xmas, 1630.] Pr. 1631, as 'lately acted before the King and Queen, with approved liking. By the Queen's Majesties comedians.'[5] | | Nabbes's *Hannibal and Scipio*. 'Acted in the year 1635 by the Queenes Majesties Servants, at their Private house in Drurye Lane.'[6] | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Richard Perkins, . | Sir John Belfare. | M. Bowyer, . | King John. | John Blaney, . | Asambeg, Viceroy of Tunis. | Mr. Michael Bowyer, | Mr. Spencer, I. | William Sherlock, | Maharaball. |
| Michael Bowyer, . | Beauford, a passionate lover of Gratiana. | M. Perkins, whose action gave grace to the play, | Fitzwater. | John Sumner, . | Mustapha, Basha of Aleppo. | Mr. Richard Perkins, | Captain Goodlack, Spencer's friend, I. | John Sumner, . . | Himulco. |
| | | | | | | | | George Stutfield, . | Soldier.[7] |
| | | | | | | | | | A Lady. |
| John Sumner, . . | Marwood, friend to Beauford. | M. Turner. . . | Old Lord Bruce. | Michael Bowyer, . | Vitelli, a gentleman of Venice disguised. | Christopher Goad, . | Mr. Foster, a Gentleman, I. | William Allen, . | Hannibal. |
| | | | | | | | | | 2 other Ladies. |
| William Robins[on], | Rawbone, a thin citizen. | M. Sumner, . . | Young Bruce. | | | ,, | A Spanish Captain, I. | Hugh Clark, . | Nuntius. |
| | | M. Jackson, . . | Chester. | William Reynolds, . | Francisco, a Jesuit. | | | Robert Axen, . . | Bomilcar. |
| William Sherlock, . | Lodam, a fat Gentleman. | M. Goad, . . | Oxford. | William Allen, . | Antonio Grimaldi, the Renegado. | ,, | The Duke of Ferrara, II. | Hugh Clark, . . | Syphax. |
| | | M. Young, . . | Leister. | | | | | Anthony Turner, . | Piston. |
| Anthony Turner, . | Justice Lanby. | M. Clark, . . . | Hubert. | William Robins[on], | Carazie, an eunuch. | William Sherlock, . | Mr. Ruffman, a swaggering gentleman, I. | | Crates. |
| William Allen, . | Captain Lanby. | M. Allen, . . . | Pandolph. | Edward Shakerley, . | Gazet, servant to Vitelli. | | | | Messenger. |
| William Wilbraham, | Isaac, Sir John's man. | M. Sherlock, who performed excellently well, | Brand. | | Aga. | | | Michael Bowyer, . | Scipio. |
| | | | | | Capiaga. | William Robinson, . | Clem, a drawer of wine under Bess Bridges, I. | John Page, . . . | Lelius. |
| John Young, . . . | Haver, a Young gentleman, lover of Mistress Jane. | | | | Master. | | | Ezekiel Fenn, . . | Sophonisba. |
| | | | Other Lords and Gentlemen, Attendants on the King. | | Boatswain. | Mr. Anthony Turner, | | Theophilus Bird, . | Massanissa. |
| | | | | | Sailors. | ,, | Bashaw Alcade, II. | Richard Perkins, . | Hanno. |
| John Dobson, . | Camelion, Rawbone's man. | | | | Tailor. | Robert Axen, . . | An English merchant, I. | Robert Axen, . . | Gisgon. |
| | | | Queen Isabel. | | 3 Turks. | | | George Stutfield, . | Bostar.[7] |
| | Physician, Surgeon, Keeper, Servants. | [A. Pennycuicke], | Matilda. | Edward Rogers, . | Donusa, niece to Amurath. | ,, | The Duke of Mantua, II. | | Lucius. |
| | | | Ladies of honour. | | | | | | A young lady. |
| | | | Lady Abbess. | Theo. Bourne, . | Paulina, sister to Vitelli. | Mr. William Allen, . | Mullisbeg, K. of Fesse, I. | William Sherlock, | Prusias. |
| Hugh Clark, . . | Gratiana, Sir John's daughter. | | | | | | | | Mutes, ladies, Soldiers, attendants. |
| John Page, . . | Jane, Justice Lanby's daughter. | | | | Manto, Servant to Donusa. | Mr. Wilbraham, . | Bashaw Alcade, I. | | Senators. |
| | | | | | | Mr. John Sumner, . | The Duke of Florence, II. | | |
| Edward Rogers, . . | Milliscent, Cardona's daughter.[2] | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Theophilus Bourne, | Toota, Queen of Fesse, and wife of Mullisbeg, II. | | |
| Timothy Read, . . | Cardona. | | | | | | | | |

[1] *Drama*, ii. 236. This and the following lists are taken from the British Museum Quartos.

[2] Mr. Fleay gives the name of Rogers's part as 'Lucibel.' *Stage*, 321.

[3] *King John and Matilda* was one of the plays which passed to Beeston's Boys, when that company was formed some time before Feb. 7, 1637. The appearance of Young in the cast indicates that the play was acted before 1629, when he probably joined the King's Revels company. It was not printed till 1655, when Andrew Pennycuike, the publisher, in his dedication of the play to the Earl of Lindsey, says,—'It past the stage with general Applause (my selfe beinge the last that Acted Matilda in it) and since through the absurdity of times, it hath laine obscured.'

[4] The list of actors prefixed to *The Renegado* probably dates between Oct. 1625, when William Robinson seems to have been acting with Slater's Queen Anne's Company (cf. above, 266), and March 1630, when the play was printed. Mr. Fleay in his *Stage* (321) dates the list 1624, when the play was first licensed, but in his *Drama* (i. 220) is doubtful whether it should be dated 1624 or 1630.

[5] Both parts of *The Fair Maid of the West* were published on June 16, 1631. The play was, no doubt, acted *c.* Xmas, 1630, before the King and Queen. As there are a great number of characters in both parts whose actors are not named, I have for the sake of brevity combined the actor lists, and omitted those characters for which no actors are given. Act v. Sc. 2 of Pt. I. begins thus:—

> 'It is not now as when Andrea liv'd,
> Or rather Andrew, our elder Journeyman.'

This Mr. Fleay (*Drama*, i. 295-296) takes to refer to Andrew Cane, a member of the Lady Elizabeth's company at the Cockpit in 1622. Of Cane, between 1622 and 1632, when he appeared as a Prince Charles's man, nothing is known. He certainly was not dead in 1630, as the above lines seem to imply if they refer to him. As Andrew was a common name, I doubt if any reference to Cane is meant.

Collier, on the basis of a doubtful ballad, considers this play to have been acted as early as 1617 (Collier, i. 387). If so, Heywood wrote it for the Lady Elizabeth's men while himself playing with Queen Anne's company at the Bull. This though unlikely, is not impossible, and cannot be taken as conclusive evidence that the ballad given by Collier is a forgery (*Drama*, i. 295-296).

[6] Printed by A. H. Bullen, *Old Plays*, New Series, i.

[7] Mr. Fleay reads, 'Hatfield' for 'Stutfield' (*Stage*, 321).

The Queen's men continued to act at the Cockpit till May 12, 1636, when the plague deaths went above forty per week. On May 10 an order was issued for the closing of the theatres,[1] but it was not sent to Herbert till May 12, when he communicated it to 'the four companys.'[2] These were undoubtedly the King's, Queen's, Prince's, and Revels companies. Herbert's entries also state that the plague deaths falling below the limit number on Feb. 23, 1637, the King granted permission to play. The companies only played till March 1, however, when the plague again became severe, and they 'laye still until the 2 of October, when they had leave to play.'[3]

During these plague years there is no indication that the Queen's London company ever acted in the provinces. This is particularly strange, because the Queen's provincial company seems to have disbanded about 1635.[4]

By Feb. 23, 1637, the Queen's men had probably abandoned the Cockpit to Beeston's Boys, for on May 12 the latter company was summoned before the Lords of the Privy Council for playing at that theatre during the time that playing was prohibited on account of the plague.[5]

When the theatres reopened on Oct. 2, 1637, the Queen's men seem to have united with the Revels company at Salisbury Court. This we learn from the following undated entry in Herbert's office-book:—'I disposed of Perkins, Sumner, Sherlock,

[1] Collier, ii. 9.
[2] Malone by Boswell, iii. 239.
[3] *Ibid.*
[4] Cf. ii. 104-105.
[5] Collier, ii. 15.

and Turner, to Salisbury Court, and joynd them with the best of that company.'[1] As this entry almost immediately follows the one which mentions that the companies 'laye still until' Oct. 2, 1637, and no doubt refers to the rearrangement of the companies on the reopening of the theatres after the plague, it may be safely dated about Oct. 2, 1637. The new Salisbury Court company apparently continued to bear the name Queen's players, for on March 6, 1639-40, a payment of £80 was made 'unto Henry Turner &c., the Queen's players, for seven plays by them acted at Court in 1638, & 1639.'[2] Moreover, after 1637 we hear nothing of a Revels company in London.

When the Queen's men left the Cockpit, they seem to have given up their plays to Beeston's Boys, who succeeded them in that theatre. However, in spite of this, they no doubt occasionally acted some of these plays, for in August, 1639, William Beeston found it necessary to have all companies but his officially prohibited from acting them.[3]

Between 1635 and 1642 Hugh Clark seems to have joined the King's men, for the Prologue to a revival of *The Custom of the Country*, a King's men's play, was spoken by 'my son' [Hugh] Clark, on that occasion.[4] Clark was also one of the players

[1] Malone by Boswell, iii. 240. Mr. Fleay is probably right in considering that Herbert's statement is not to be taken literally. There is no evidence that the Master of the Revels had the power of rearranging companies. Of course he may have suggested such a change (*Stage*, 353).

[2] *Apology*, 511. Probably 'Henry' Turner is a slip for 'Anthony' Turner. No Henry Turner is mentioned elsewhere.

[3] Collier, ii. 24-25. Apparently the proprietary rights in these plays was vested in Beeston as manager of the company.

[4] *Drama*, ii. 210.

who published the 1647 folio of Beaumont and Fletcher's plays.[1]

The Queen's men probably continued to act at Salisbury Court till the closing of the theatres in August, 1642. There are no references to them in the provinces.[2]

[1] Cf. above, 172.

[2] For Queen Henrietta's provincial company, cf. ii. 101 f.

## COURT PERFORMANCES

| | |
|---|---|
| 1633. Nov. 19, . . | *The Young Admiral* (Shirley). { (The Queen's players).[1] |
| 1633, . . . . | Other plays. ( ,, ).[2] |
| 1634. Jan. 14, . . . | *The Tale of the Tub* (Jonson). ( ,, ).[3] |
| Jan. 30, . . . | *The Nightwalkers* (Fletcher and Shirley). ( ,, ).[4] |
| Feb. 6, . . . | *The Gamester* (Shirley). ( ,, ).[5] |
| 1634, . . . . | Five plays. ( ,, ).[6] |
| 1635, . . . . | Nine plays. ( ,, ).[7] |
| 1636. Feb. 22, . . | *The Duke's Mistress* (Shirley). ( ,, ).[8] |
| 1636. Feb. 28, . . | *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* (Beaumont and Fletcher). ( ,, ).[9] |
| 1638-9, . . . . | Seven plays. ( ,, ).[10] |

### NOTES TO COURT PERFORMANCES

[1] Malone by Boswell, iii. 234. Herbert notes that this play was acted at St. James's on the King's birthday, and was 'likt by the K. and Queen.' Mr. Fleay conjectures that the Court performance of Randolph's *Amintas*, in 1632-3, was by the Queen's men (*Stage*, 315). There seems to be no evidence for this conjecture (*Drama*, ii. 165-168).

[2] Chalmers, *Apology*, 507. On Dec. 31, 1634, Christopher Beeston was paid £70 for plays acted at Court by the Queen's players 'in 1633.'

[3] Malone by Boswell, iii. 236. Herbert says this play of Jonson's was not liked by the Court.

[4] Malone by Boswell, iii. 236. This play was acted before the King and Queen, and 'Likt as a merry play.'

[5] Malone by Boswell, iii. 236; Title-page, quarto, 1637. Herbert says, 'The Gamester was . . . made by Sherley, out of a plot of the king's, given him by mee; and well likte. The king sayd it was the best play he had seen for seven years.'

[6] Chalmers, *Apology*, 509. On March 24, 1636, a warrant for £90 was issued 'unto Mr. Christopher Beeston, for 8 plays acted by the Queen's players at Court, in 1634, whereof one at Hampton-court.'

[7] Chalmers, *Apology*, 510. On May 10, 1637, a warrant for £150 was issued 'to Mr. Christopher Beeston for plays acted by the Queen's servants —(viz.) Four at Hampton-court, at £20 per play, in 1635.—Five at Whitehall in the same year; and two plays acted by the New Company [*i.e.* Beeston's Boys].'

[8] Malone by Boswell, iii. 238; Title-page, quarto, 1638. Mr. Fleay conjectures that the performance of Jonson's *Epicene* at St. James's on Feb. 18, 1636, was by the Queen's men. The only evidence for this seems to be the performance of his *Tale of a Tub* by those players at Court on Jan. 14, 1634.

[9] Malone by Boswell, iii. 238. This performance was at St. James's.

[10] Chalmers, *Apology*, 511. On March 6, 1640, a warrant for £80 was issued 'unto Henry Turner, &c., the Queen's players, for seven plays by them acted at Court in 1638, & 1639; whereof £20 for one play at Richmond.'

## VII

## 2, RED BULL—2, KING CHARLES I.'s COMPANY

### I

In 1625, when Charles I. came to the throne and took his father's company under his patronage, Smith, Hobbes, Penn, and possibly others of his old company, the former Prince's men, joined the King's players.[1] The remaining actors of the old Prince's company, who were acting at the Red Bull,[2] seem to have united with the King's provincial company to form a new company, which was known in London as the Red Bull and in the provinces as the King's company. The evidence for this is, that after 1629 the Red Bull players were invariably called the King's men in the provinces, and that on April 11, 1627, the King's company of the Globe and Blackfriars found it necessary to ask Sir Henry Herbert, the Master of the Revels, to order the Red Bull players to stop acting Shakespeare's plays,[3] a thing the latter men would hardly have dared to do unless they claimed some right to these plays, or relied on the King, as their former and present patron, to justify them.[4]

[1] Cf. above, 161.

[2] *Ibid.*, 236-237.

[3] Malone by Boswell, iii. 229.

[4] Concerning the Red-Bull company after 1625, Mr. Fleay has very little to say (*Stage*, 321-322 ; 353-354).

In November, 1627, this company visited Ludlow. When they were performing at their inn on the evening of Nov. 21, at about ten or eleven o'clock, six or seven drunken men made a disturbance outside. Richard Errington, who was taking money at the door, fearing an attack, 'tooke his money out the boxe and putt ytt in his hand.' Another player then came to the door and demanded the cause of the noise. One of the drunken men, by name Powell, hearing this, drew his rapier and ran at Errington, but without injuring him. The town sergeant, William Baker, now appeared, and attempted to restore peace. The drunken men promptly seized Baker, dragged him off through the streets, and gave him a severe beating. The next day Errington appeared before the magistrates to give his evidence. In his deposition he is described as 'Richard Errington, of the Citty of London, pewterer, aged L tie yeares or thereaboute.' [1]

II

In 1629 this company was, apparently, reorganised under the management of William Perry and Richard Weekes, for on Nov. 10, 1629, a licence was granted to 'William Perrye and Richard Weekes, his Majestie's sworne servantes, . . . with the rest of their company, John Kerke, Edward Armiger, Hughe Tatterdell, Deavid (?) Ferris, Robert Hint and George Williams, all of the Red Bull company.' [2] This licence they presented at Reading on Nov. 30, 1629. It was probably at the time of this reorganisation that Richard Errington, who is

[1] Cf. ii. 326.

[2] *Ibid.*, 386.

mentioned in 1631 as one of the managers of Queen Henrietta's provincial company,[1] left the Red Bull-King's players.

On April 30, 1633, a new licence was granted to this company, and confirmed by the Master of the Revels on May 24, 'W^th^ a non obstante all restraint to the contrary.' This licence they presented at Norwich on July 3, 1633.[2]

On March 1, 1634, they again visited Norwich. They presented their licence of April 30, 1633, and were allowed to play. On March 15 William Perry was called before the Mayor's Court and asked why his company continued to act in the city after the time agreed upon for their departure. He replied that their Patent allowed them to play in any town for forty days. The Court then requested them to stop playing on account of 'the greate hurt of the poore,' but 'they would give no answer thereunto but desired eight dayes longer.' Apparently the company continued to act in the city, for, as a result of deliberations on March 19 and 22 the Mayor's Court decided 'a peticion be sent up to M^r^ Birch to be exhibited to his Ma^tie^ against the comon use of stage plays in this city by reason that the maintenance of the Inhabitants here doth consist of worke & makeinge of manufactures. And that a Letter be sent up to the said M^r^ Birch to be p^r^sented to the Lords in case his Ma^ties^ Reference be obtained mencioninge the grievances and intreatinge redresse.'[3]

A new licence was granted to this company on March 2, 1635, to continue in force till Sept. 2, 1636.

[1] Cf. ii. 104. [2] *Ibid.*, 354. [3] *Ibid.*, 354-355.

This licence was presented by Richard Weeks and John Shank with the 1633 licence, when the company visited Norwich on June 6, 1635. On that occasion they were allowed to play in the city till June 18, 1635.[1]

On March 8, 1636, Anthony Mingay of Norwich, writing to Framlingham Gawdy of West Hartling Hall, Norfolk, made the following interesting reference to these players: 'I pray tell your sons that the Red Bull company of players are now in town, and have acted one play with good applause, and are well clad and act by candlelight.'[2]

Almost immediately after this the company went to Canterbury, where they acted during Lent. On

[1] Cf. ii. 357. This John Shanke was, no doubt, the 'one Shanks, a player,' referred to in the following paragraphs from *The Perfect Diurnal* of Oct. 24, 1642, 'This day there came three of the Lord General's Officers post from the army to London, signifying that there was a great fight on Sunday last, and being brought to the Parliament and examined, it appeared they were not sent from the army with any letters, or otherwise, but in a cowardly manner run from their captains at the beginning of the fight, and had most basely possessed the people, both as they came away, and at their coming to town, with many false rumours, giving forth in speeches that there were 20,000 men killed on both sides, and that there were not four in all their companies escaped with life besides themselves; and many other strange wonders, though altogether false, it being rather conceived that their companies, like themselves, upon the beginning of the fight, very valiantly took to their heels and ran away.

'And, after further inquiry was made after these commanders, it was no wonder to hear their strange news, for they were Captain Wilson, Lieut. Whitney, and one Shanks, a player. An affidavit was offered to be made, that one of them said, before he went out with the Earl of Essex, that he would take the Parliament's pay, but would never fight against any of the King's party; and the other two were very rude and insolent persons: whereupon the House ordered they should all three be committed to the Gatehouse, and brought to condign punishment, according to marshal law, for their base cowardliness' (Collier, iii. 485-486). The reference cannot be to John Shank, who was one of the leading men in the Globe and Blackfriars King's company, in 1635, and died in January, 1636 (Collier, iii. 483).

[2] *Hist. MSS. Com.*, x. App. 157.

March 25 James Nicholson, Mayor of Canterbury, wrote to Archbishop Laud, telling him that certain players had lately come to Canterbury, and in obedience to his Majesty's commission had played there eight days. The fact that their evening performances continued till midnight had led to great disorders in the city, and daily complaints had been made to him. Finding these complaints well founded and the period being Lent, he had ordered the players to desist, whereupon one of them told him they would play without his leave. Nevertheless they left the city, but intended to return, and it is reported were going to complain of the writer. He asked the Archbishop's direction. On March 29 the Council replied to the Mayor, commending his action, and stating that the King had been informed of the matter by the Archbishop and had commanded them to notify the Mayor that in future no players were to play in Canterbury during Lent without the special permission of the Archbishop. On April 5 Nicholson replied to the Council, thanking them for their redress of his grievances, and stating that 'the players complained of are of the company of the Fortune playhouse, and the principal of them was Weekes and Perry. The latter was the man that most affronted the writer, saying that he would play whether the mayor would or not, and when on complaints of citizens who could not restrain their servants from being at the plays till near midnight, the writer desired Perry to keep better hours or he would acquaint the Lords with their disorder, Perry replied that he cared not.' [1]

[1] *Cal. State Papers*, 1636. The nature of the disorders complained of

From these documents it is clear that late in 1635 or early in 1636 the Red Bull-King's company moved into the Fortune. The Prince's men, who had occupied that theatre, no doubt went to the Red Bull.[1] This arrangement lasted till Easter, 1640, when 'the Princes company went to the Fortune and the Fortune company to the Red Bull.'[2] The last mention of this Red Bull-King's company is in 1641-2, when they acted at Coventry under the management of William Perry.[3]

## PROVINCIAL VISITS

I

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1626-27. Nov. 16, '26, . | Coventry. | (The King's players). |
| 1627. Bet. Jan. 12 and July 8, . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 21, 22, . . . | Ludlow. | (Richard Errington and the King's players). |
| 1627-28. Jan. 9, '28, . . . | Coventry. | (The King's players). |
| Sept. 1,'28, . . . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| 1628-29. March 9, '29, . . | Canterbury. | ( ,, ). |

II

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1629-30. Nov. 30, '29, . . | Reading. | (William Perry, Richard Weeks, and the Red Bull Co.). |
| March–July, '30, . . | Bristol. | (The King's players). |

may be judged by the following statement of the Mayor :—'It was not a player but Mr. Mosely, who dwells near Tower Hill, London, who inebriated and abused one of the two maidens, in the playhouse.' Mr. Fleay is unable to identify the company to which the above documents refer (cf. *Stage*, 363).

[1] Cf. above, 220-221.

[2] Malone by Boswell, iii. 241.

[3] Cf. Provincial List, below, 278.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1630-31. [Nov., '30], . . | Reading. | (William Perry, Richard Weeks, and the King's players). |
| July–Sept., '31, . . | Bristol. | (The King's players). |
| 1631. . . . . | Worcester. | ( ,, ). |
| 1631-2. May, '32, . . | Doncaster. | ( ,, ). |
| July 15, '32, . . | Doncaster. | (Mr. Perry's company). |
| Aug. 20, '32, . . | Doncaster. | (The King's players). |
| 1632, . . . . | Worcester | ( ,, ). |
| 1632-3. March, '33, . . | Doncaster. | ( ,, ). |
| [After Feb. 19, '33], . . | Leicester. | (Mr. Perry's company). |
| Dec. 12, '32–Dec. 4, '33, . | Coventry. | (Mr. Perry and the King's players). |
| Bet. April 8–May 8, '33, . | Dover. | (The King's players). |
| 1632-3. July 3, '33, . . . | Norwich. | (Mr. Perry and the King's players). |
| 1633-4. March 1–[23], '34, . | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| 1634-5. April 13, '35, . . | Coventry. | (The King's players). |
| Before Nov. 22, '35, . . | Leicester. | (Mr. Perry's company). |
| June 6-18, '35, . . . | Norwich. | (Weeks, Shank, and the King's players.) |
| 1635-6. March 17–25, '36, . | Canterbury. | (Weeks Perry, and the Fortune players). |
| April 24, ['36], . . . | Doncaster. | (Mr. Perry and the King's players). |
| May 11, '36, . . . | Norwich. | (Perry, Weeks, and the King's players). |

| | |
|---|---|
| 1636, . . . . . | Windsor (town). (The King's players). |
| 1637-8. ['38], . . . . | Coventry. Performed *hocus-pocus.* ( ,, ). |
| 1641. June 26, . . . | Doncaster. ( ,, ). |
| 1641-2. [Dec.], '41–Dec. 7, '42, . | Coventry. (Mr. Perry's company). |

## VIII

## 4, KING'S REVELS COMPANY

In 1629 Salisbury Court theatre was built in Whitefriars,[1] and occupied by a new King's Revels company,[2] who acted there till January, 1632, when they moved into the Fortune.[3] How long they remained at the Fortune is doubtful. At any rate, by 1635 they had returned to Salisbury Court, for in that year Richard Brome's *The Spargus Garden* was acted by them in that theatre.[4]

Only two lists of this company exist. One of these, which is very full, was taken down by the Town Clerk of Norwich on March 10, 1635, when the company applied for leave to act in that town. The other is prefixed to N. Richard's *Messalina*. The Norwich list mentions the following players :—

'Goorge Stutvile.
John Yonge.
Edward May.
W^m^ Wilbraham.
W^m^ Cartwright, sen.
Willm. Cartwright, Jun.

[1] Collier, iii. 106 ; Malone by Boswell, iii. 52.

[2] They acted Shirley's *The Changes, or Love in a Maze*, there about Jan. 10, 1632 (cf. Herbert MS., and title-page of 1632 quarto).

[3] Cf. above, 219-220.

[4] Cf. quarto of 1640.

Xxofer Goade.
Timothy Reade.
Thomas Bourne.
John Robynson.
Thomas Lovell.
Thomas Sands.
Thomas Jorden.
Walt[r] Willyams.
John Barret.
Thomas Loveday.
John Harris.
Antony Dover.
Richard Kendall.
Roger Tosedall.
Elis Bedowe.
—— Mairvin.
——Mistale.
John Stretch.
Henry ffield.
George Willans.
James fferret.
Antony Bray.' [1]

Though the name of the company is not given in the Norwich records, a comparison of the actors in it with those who performed in Nathaniel Richard's '*Messalina, The Roman Emperesse* . . . Acted With generall applause divers times, by the Com-pany of his Majesties Revells,' [2] and printed in 1640, shows that it was undoubtedly the King's Revels company. The players and their parts in *Messalina* were as follows :—

[1] Cf. ii. 356.

[2] Quarto, 1640.

| | |
|---|---|
| 'Will. Cartwright, Sen. . . | Claudius, *Emperour.* |
| Christopher Goad . . . | Silius, *chiefe Favorite to the Empresse.* |
| John Robinson . . . | Saufellus, *chiefe of Counsell to Silius and Messallina.* |
| Sam. Tomson . . . . | Menester, *an actor and Favorite compel'd by the Emperesse.* |
| Rich. Johnson . . . . | Montanus, *a Knight in Rome defence vertuously inclined.* |
| Will Hall . . . . | Mela, *Seneca's Brother.* |
| John Barret . . . . | Messallina, *Empresse.* |
| Tho. Jordan . . . . | Lepida, *mother to Messallina.* |
| Mathias Morris . . . | Sylana, *wife to Silius.*'[1] |

On May 10, 1636, the theatres were ordered to be closed on account of the plague.[2] With the exception of the week from Feb. 23 to March 1, 1637, they remained closed till Oct. 2, 1637.[3] When they reopened, the King's Revels and Queen's companies seem to have joined forces and acted at Salisbury Court.[4] The new company was known as the Queen's company, and nothing more is heard of a King's Revels company in London.[5] Those of the King's Revels players who were not included in the new Queen's company may have joined William Daniel's provincial King's Revels men.[6]

[1] Quarto, 1640. The exact date of this list cannot be fixed. Mr. Fleay supposes it to belong after the plague of 1637 (*Drama*, ii. 169), but the fact that Christopher Goad appears in it, shows that it must have been before March 10, 1635, by which date Goad had joined the King's Revels (cf. above, and 266). For a discussion of Mr. Fleay's theory that Bartholomew Jones, Richard Whiting, etc., who appeared at Banbury on May 6, 1633, were the King's Revels company (*Stage*, 331), cf. ii. 106 f.

[2] Collier, ii. 9.

[3] Malone by Boswell, iii. 239.

[4] Cf. above, 267-268.

[5] *Ibid.*, 268.

[6] Cf. ii. 8-9.

## COURT PERFORMANCES

| | |
|---|---|
| 1631-32, . . . | Six plays. (The Children of the Revels).[1] |
| 1635. October, . | Two plays. (The Salisbury Court players).[2] |
| 1636. Feb. 24, . | *Love's Aftergame, or the Proxy.* ( ,, ).[2] |

## PROVINCIAL VISITS

| | |
|---|---|
| 1635. March 10, . | Norwich. (George Stutvile and company). |
| 1636. April 22, . | Leicester. (The King's Revels Company) |

[1] *Apology*, 508. On Jan. 24, 1635, a warrant for £30 was issued to William Blagrave for three plays acted at Whitehall by the Children of the Revels in 1631. Their bill was signed by Sir Henry Herbert. On Jan. 30, a similar warrant was issued, also for 3 plays in 1631 [1632]. Mr. Fleay, who quotes Collier as his authority, considers that only two plays were performed, and the Children of the Revels received £30 each for them (*Stage*, 315). This is very unlikely, as £10 was the regular payment for a play. Collier's quotation from the Chamberlain's book is ambiguous (Collier, ii. 5).

[2] Malone by Boswell, iii. 238 ; *Apology*, 509. On Feb. 8, 1637, Richard Heton was paid £50 for three plays by the Salisbury Court players before the King in October and February, 1635-6. For two of these performed at Hampton Court the Company received £40, and for one at St. James's £10.

# PART III

# LESSER MEN'S COMPANIES

1558-1642

# I

## 1, 2, LORD AMBROSE DUDLEY, EARL OF WARWICK'S COMPANIES

### I

The first recorded appearance of a company of players under the patronage of Lord Ambrose Dudley was in 1559-60 at Gloucester. It is improbable that Lord Dudley had a company under his patronage before this, because he was in partial disgrace from 1553 to 1558 for his share in the Lady Jane Grey conspiracy, and did not come into prominence at the English Court till after the accession of Elizabeth. On Dec. 26, 1561, Lord Ambrose Dudley was created Earl of Warwick, and from that date his players were known as the Earl of Warwick's men. From 1559-60 to 1564 this company acted every year in the provinces, though it did not appear in London till Christmas, 1564-5, when it performed two plays at Court. As nothing further is heard of the Earl of Warwick's players till 1574-5, his company of 1559-60 was probably disbanded in 1565.

### II

In 1574 or early in 1575 Laurence and John Dutton seem to have formed a company of players to act under the Earl of Warwick's patronage, for

in the Council Registers it is stated that Warwick's men acted at Court on Feb. 14, 1575,[1] and in the accounts of the Revels at Court for 1574-5, there is a payment for 'the Duttons playe,'[2] which can only refer to the performance by Warwick's men. Furthermore, on March 11, 1576, 'Lawrence Dutton and John Dutton, servants to the Earl of Warwick,' were paid for a play presented at Court on March 6, 1576. As the Duttons were members of Sir Robert Lane's men during 1572-3, they must have left that company between 1572-3 and 1574-5.[3] Whether or not other members of Sir Robert Lane's company, which probably broke up in 1572-3, passed over to the Earl of Warwick's company is uncertain. With the exception of the Duttons, none of the actors of either company are known.

How long this Earl of Warwick's company under the leadership of the Duttons lasted cannot be determined. They acted frequently at Court till 1580, and in the provinces till 1581-2. After this nothing is heard of an Earl of Warwick's company till March, 1592, when such a company acted at Ipswich. As Ambrose Dudley, Earl of Warwick, died on Feb. 20, 1590, without living issue, and his titles and honours became extinct till 1618, when Robert Rich, Baron Rich, was created Earl of Warwick, this company could have had no legitimate right to bear the Earl of Warwick's name. Possibly these men were the survivors of the 1582 company, but if so, it is strange that they are not mentioned

[1] Cf. below, 288. [2] Cunningham, *Revels*, 95.

[3] Cf. below, 309. For an account of Mr. Fleay's theories concerning the Earl of Warwick's men, cf. below, 287 *n.* 1.

in the municipal records from 1582 to 1591-2. Possibly the entry in the Ipswich records is a mistake on the Chamberlain's part. If the latter be the case, the Earl of Warwick's company most likely broke up in 1583, when the Duttons left it for the New Queen's company.[1]

[1] Cf. above, 7. Mr. Fleay's statements about the Earl of Warwick's men are very confusing. Concerning the formation and breaking up of this company (he seems to consider that there was only one Earl of Warwick's company) he makes the following statements :—(1) In his Index list of the companies he dates Warwick's men 1564-1580 (*Stage*, 369). (2) In his treatment of the companies from 1559-1586, he says, that Sir Robert Lane's men (1571-1573) of whom the chief were Laurence and John Dutton 'most likely broke in 1574, and the Duttons formed a company for the Earl of Warwick, which acted 1575-1580, January 1' (*Stage*, 35). (3) In giving a list of the Court performances for 1572-3, he says :—'The men of [L. Warwick] "under the Duttons." This company was probably set up when Warwick was sworn Privy Councillor, 1572 (*Nichols*, iii. 39).' (*Stage*, 20.) According to these statements 1564, 1575, and 1572 are offered as dates for the formation of the Earl of Warwick's company. The only evidence for supposing that the company broke up in 1580 is that it did not appear at Court after that date. As the company played in Winchester in 1581-2 there can be no doubt that it existed after 1580 (cf. below, 290). Concerning the connection of the Duttons with Sir Robert Lane's and the Earl of Warwick's companies Mr. Fleay makes the following assertions :—(1) In his Index list of actors, he thus dates the careers of the Duttons, 'John Dutton . . . War. 1573-80 ; Q. E. 1583-91. Laurence Dutton . . . Lane, 1571-2 ; War. 1573-80 ; Q. E. 1583-91.' The obvious implication is that John Dutton was not a member of Lane's men during 1571-2, yet in his account of these companies Mr. Fleay states 'Sir Robert Lane's, 1571-1573, of whom the chief were Laurence and John Dutton' (*Stage*, 35). As I have shown above, the Duttons probably formed a company for the Earl of Warwick in 1574 or early in 1575 (cf. above, 285-286. For further contradictory statements by Mr. Fleay about Sir Robert Lane's men, cf. below, 310 *n.* 3).

## COURT PERFORMANCES

### I

(1, Company.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1564-5. Christmas, . | Two plays. | (Earl of Warwick's players).[1] |

### II

(2, Company.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1575. Feb. 14, . | | (Earl of Warwick's players).[2] |
| Dec. 26, . . | | ( ,, ).[3] |
| 1576. Jan. 1, . . | | ( ,, ).[3] |
| March 6, . . | | ( ,, ).[4] |
| Dec. 26, . . | *The Painter's Daughter.* | ( ,, ).[5] |
| 1577. Feb. 18, . . | *The Irish Knight.* | ( ,, ).[6] |
| 1578. Dec. 26, . . | *The Three Sisters of Mantua.* | ( ,, ).[7] |
| 1579. Feb. 2, . . | *The History of* —— | ( ,, ).[8] |
| March 1, . . | *The Knight in the Burning Rock.* | ( ,, ).[9] |
| 1580. Jan. 1, . . | *A History of the Four Sons of Fabius.* | ( ,, ).[10] |

### NOTES TO COURT PERFORMANCES

[1] Chalmers, *Apology*, 394; Cunningham, *Revels*, xxviii. On Jan. 18, 1565, the Earl of Warwick's men were paid £13, 6s. 8d. for performing two plays before the Queen at Christmas, 1564-5.

[2] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxi, 95. On Feb. 16, the Earl of Warwick's men were paid £10 for performing a play before the Queen at Richmond on 'Shrovemonday last past.' Mr. Fleay gives a performance at Court by Warwick's men during Christmas, 1572-3 (*Stage*, 33, 20). His reason for so doing is that he conjectures the play by 'the Duttons' mentioned in the Revels Accounts for 1572-3 (Cunningham, *Revels*, 34, 36), was given by Warwick's and not Lane's men, the 'Duttons' having left the latter company in 1572. As there is no evidence to show that the Duttons were connected with Warwick's men till 1574-5, or that Lane's men broke up till 1574-5, it is safer to assume that the 1572-3 play at Court, in which the Duttons were engaged, was given by Lane's men (cf below, 310 *n.* 3).

[3] Chalmers, *Apology*, 395. On Jan. 2, 1576, the Earl of Warwick's players were paid £20 for presenting two plays before the Queen 'on St. Stephen's day, and New Year's day last, at night.'

[4] Chalmers, *Apology*, 395. On March 11, 1576, 'Lawrence Dutton and John Dutton, servants to the Earl of Warwick' were paid £10 for presenting a play before the Queen 'on Shrove Monday last.' Mr. Fleay (*Stage*, 24) gives March 6, 1576, as the date of this performance, but on page 33 (*Stage*), Feb. 18, 1576. The latter is evidently a slip.

[5] Cunningham, *Revels*, 101; Chalmers, *Apology*, 395. On Jan. 20, 1577, the Earl of Warwick's men were paid £6, 13s. 4d., and granted a reward of £10 for presenting this play before the Queen at Hampton Court, 'in the Christmas holydays.'

[6] Cunningham, *Revels*, 114; Chalmers, *Apology*, 396. On Feb. 20, 1577, the Earl of Warwick's men were paid £6, 13s. 4d. and given a reward of 5 marks for presenting this play before the Queen at Whitehall on Shrove Monday.

[7] Cunningham, *Revels*, 125; Chalmers, *Apology*, 396. On Jan. 16, 1579, the Earl of Warwick's players were paid for a play, probably this one, presented before Her Majesty. The play was given at Richmond on 'St. Stephens daie at night.'

[8] Cunningham, *Revels*, 142; Chalmers, *Apology*, 397. On Jan. 18, 1579, the Earl of Warwick's players were paid £6, 13s. 4d. for 'a play that should have been played on Candlemas-day last.' From the Revels Accounts it is learned that the reason the play was not presented was that 'the Quenes Ma^tie^ wold not come to heare the same and therefore put of.' Possibly the delay in payment was due, as Mr. Fleay suggests (*Stage*, 27), to a dispute as to whether or not plays prepared for Court and not presented should receive full payments.

[9] Cunningham, *Revels*, 142; Chalmers, *Apology*, 397. On March 13, 1579, the Earl of Warwick's players were paid £6, 13s. 4d., and given a reward of £3s, 6s. 8d. for presenting this play before the Queen at Whitehall, on Shrove Sunday.

[10] Cunningham, *Revels*, 154; Chalmers, *Apology*, 397. On Jan. 25, 1580, the Earl of Warwick's players received £10, which included the regular payment and the Queen's reward, for presenting this play at Court. The play was given at Whitehall 'on New Yeares daie at nighte.' The garments worn by the players were 'wholie furnyshed in this offyce,' *i.e.* from the Revels wardrobe.

## PROVINCIAL VISITS

### I

(1, Company.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1559-60, . . . . | Gloucester. | (Lord Ambrose Dudley's players). |
| 1560-61, . . . . | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| [Autumn, '61], . . . | Canterbury. | ( ,, ). |
| | Winchester. | ( ,, ). |

(On Dec. 26, 1561, Lord Ambrose Dudley was created Earl of Warwick.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1561-2. [Spring, '62], | Canterbury. | (Earl of Warwick's players). |
| June 8, '62, | Oxford. | ( ,, ). |
| | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| 1562-3. [Jan., '63], | Canterbury. | ( ,, ). |
| [Before Jan. 30, '63], | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| June 9, '63, | Plymouth. | ( ,, ). |
| 1563-4. *c.* Jan. or Feb., '64, | Canterbury. | ( ,, ). |
| | Winchester. | (Lord Ambrose Dudley's players). |
| | Gloucester. | (Earl of Warwick's players). |

II

(2, Company.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1574-5, | Leicester. | (Earl of Warwick's players). |
| 1575. [July 27–Aug. 3], | Lichfield. | ( ,, ). |
| 1576, | Stratford-on-Avon. | (Earl of Warwick's players). |
| 1576-7, | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| Sept. 1, '77, | Nottingham. | ( ,, ). |
| 1581-2, | Winchester. | (Lord Ambrose Dudley's players). |

(Lord Ambrose Dudley, Earl of Warwick, died Feb. 21, 1590, and the title became extinct till 1618.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1591-2. March 10, '92, | Ipswich. | (Earl of Warwick's players). |

## II

## 1, LORD STRANGE—2, 4, 5, EARL OF DERBY'S COMPANIES

### I

A COMPANY of players under the patronage of Lord Strange first appeared at Winchester in 1563-4, when they were given a reward of 7s. 3d. by the town. At this time Henry Stanley was Lord Strange. He bore that title from 1531 to 1572, when he became Earl of Derby, and his players were known as the Earl of Derby's men. From 1563-4 to 1582-3 we find frequent notices of this company in the provinces. They did not appear in London or at Court till 1580, when they acted at Court. As nothing is heard of a Derby company for ten years after 1582-3, these players probably disbanded about that date.[1] This is the 2, Derby company.

### II

Ferdinando Stanley, who became Earl of Derby on Sept. 25, 1593, had been the patron of a company

[1] The only hint we have concerning the actors of this company is found in an entry of a payment of 6s. to 'Beeston and his fellowes,' at Barnstaple in 1560-1. This Beeston may have been the father of Christopher Beeston, who was probably a member of the company of Ferdinando Stanley, son of Henry Stanley, and Lord Strange from 1572-93. If so, 'Beeston and his fellowes' were not improbably the company of Henry Stanley, Lord Strange, from 1531 to 1572.

of players, known by his former title, as Lord Strange's men, since 1576-7. These men in 1593 became the Earl of Derby's players. They acted under this name till about April 16, 1594, when Ferdinando Stanley died. An account of this company is given in the Strange-Chamberlain companies.[1] This is the 4, Derby company.

III

On the death of Ferdinando Stanley, his brother William Stanley became Earl of Derby. By September 15, 1594, he had granted his patronage to a company of players, for on that date the Earl of Derby's company visited Norwich. From 1594 to 1617 this company is frequently mentioned in the provinces. In September, 1596, they acted at York with Lord Darce's men.[2] On February 27, 1602, the Mayor's Court of Norwich granted permission to this company to play in that city, but when the company returned on June 9, the Court ordered that if they played in the city 'contrary to Mr Maiors commaundmt' then they should be 'committed to Prison.'[3] What the company had done to be thus threatened is unknown. As it did not again visit Norwich, the breach with the authorities was probably irreparable. In 1609 the Earl of Derby's men asked leave of the Louth corporation to play at the May-day Fair in that city, but were refused, though given a reward of 5s.[4] Not improbably, some of the plays acted by this company were written by their patron, William Stanley, for on June 30,

[1] Cf. above, 90.
[2] Cf. below, 295.
[3] Cf. ii. 338.
[4] *Ibid.*, 324.

1599, George Fenner wrote from London to Hun. Galdelli or Giuseppi Tusinga, at Venice, 'The Earl of Derby is busy penning comedies for the common players.'[1] As nothing is heard of an Earl of Derby's company after 1617, William Stanley's players probably disbanded about that time.[2] This is the 5, Derby company.

[1] *Cal. State Papers*, v. 227. Concerning Thomas Heywood's connection with this company *c.* 1598-99, cf. ii. 141 f. The fact that this company was important enough to have Heywood write plays for them indicates that they probably acted sometimes in London.

[2] William Stanley, Earl of Derby, seems to have taken a lively interest in other companies as well as the one under his immediate patronage, for on Dec. 2, 1606, he wrote to the Mayor of Chester asking him to allow the 'Lo : of Harforth (*i.e.* Hereford) his men,' to act in Chester and to grant them the Town Hall, if they should chance to visit that city (cf. ii. 234-235). The connection of the Earls of Derby and the town of Chester was, of course, close. Their fine old town house is still to be seen in that city.

## COURT PERFORMANCES

(2, Derby Co. Patron, Henry Stanley, Lord Strange, 1531–1572, Oct. 24; Earl of Derby, 1572, Oct. 24-1593, Sept. 25.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1580. February 14, | *The History of the Soldan and the Duke of* —— | (Earl of Derby's players).[1] |
| 1581. January 1, | *A Storie of* —— | ( ,, ).[2] |
| 1582. December 30, | *A History of Love and Fortune.* | ( ,, ).[3] |

[1] Cunningham, *Revels*, 155 ; Chalmers, *Apology*, 397. On Feb. 23, 1580 the Earl of Derby's players were paid £6, 13s. 4d. and given a reward of £3, 6s. 8d. for playing 'The History of the Soldan and the Duke of . . .' before the Queen at Whitehall on Sunday, Feb. 14 (*i.e.* Shrove Sunday night).

[2] Cunningham, *Revels*, 167 ; Chalmers, *Apology*, 398. On Jan. 20, 1581, the Earl of Derby's players were paid £10 for playing before the Queen at Whitehall on New Year's day.

[3] Cunningham, *Revels*, 176-177. This performance was before the Queen at Windsor 'on the Sondaie at night next before newe yeares daie.'

## PROVINCIAL VISITS

### I

(1, Strange-2, Derby Co. Patron, Henry Stanley, Lord Strange 1531-1572, Oct. 24; Earl of Derby, 1572, Oct. 24–1593, Sept. 25.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| [1560-1, . . . . . | Barnstaple. | (' Beeston and his fellowes ')].[1] |
| 1563-4, . . . . . | Winchester. | (Lord Strange's players). |
| 1564-5. [Autumn, '64], . . | Canterbury. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov., '64, . . . . | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |
| | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| 1566-7. Bet. July 3–31, '67, . | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |
| [*c.* Sept., '67], . . . | Canterbury. | ( ,, ). |
| | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| 1569-70. October, '69, . . | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |
| | Plymouth. | ( ,, ). |
| 1573-4. [Bet. Mar. 31–Aug. 29, 74], | Coventry. | (Earl of Derby's players). |
| 1577-8. [After Feb., '78], . . | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| May 28, '78, . . . | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 23, '77–Oct. 22, '78, . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| Aug. 30, '78, . . . | Nottingham. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 23, '77–Oct. 22, '78, . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| 1578-9. *c.* end Oct., '78, . . | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |
| July 11, '78–June 9, '79, . | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| 1579-80. April 17, '80, . . | Exeter. | ( ,, ). |
| 1580, . . . . . | Stratford-on-Avon. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 29, '79–Nov. 22, '80, . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| 1580-1, . . . . | Winchester. | ( ,, ). |
| | Exeter. | ( ,, ). |
| June 9, '80–June 10, '81, . | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| Aug. 9, '81, . . . | Nottingham. | ( ,, ). |
| 1581, . . . . . | Abingdon. | ( ,, ). |
| 1581-2, . . . . . | Winchester. | ( ,, ). |
| | Nottingham. | ( ,, ). |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Norwich. | (Earl of Derby's players). |
| 1582-3. [*c.* June 15, '82]–June 15, '83, . . . . | Bath. | ( „ ). |
| | Leicester. | ( „ ). |

II

(5, Derby Co. Patron, William Stanley, Earl of Derby, 1594, Ap. 16–1642, Sept. 29.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1593-4. Sept. 15, '94, . . | Norwich. | (Earl of Derby's players). |
| 1595-6. Spring, '96, . . | Canterbury. | ( „ ). |
| Oct. 10, '95–Oct. 14, '96, . | Bath. | ( „ ). |
| Early in August, '96, . . | Bristol. | ( „ ). |
| | Gloucester. | ( „ ). |
| Dec. 2, '95–Nov. 1, '96, . | Coventry. | ( „ ). |
| Sept., '96, . . . . | York. | ( „ ). |
| 1596-7. Oct. 14, '96–Oct. 14, '97, | Bath. | ( „ ). |
| August, '97, . . . | Bristol. | ( „ ). |
| Nov. 1, '96–Dec. 6, '97, . | Coventry. | ( „ ). |
| | Leicester. | ( „ ). |
| 1597-8. Dec. 6, '97–Dec. 5, '98, . | Coventry. | ( „ ). |
| [Jan. 9, '97]–Sept. 28, '98, . | Leicester. | ( „ ). |
| Dec. 6, '97–Dec. 5, '98, . | Coventry. | ( „ ).[2] |
| 1598-9. [Bet. Sept. 29, '98 and June 22, '99], . . . | Leicester. | ( „ ). |
| 1599–1600. Oct. 16, '99, . . | Leicester. | ( „ ). |
| 1601-2. Feb. 27, '02, . . | Norwich. | ( „ ). |
| Dec. 2, '01–Dec. 20, '02, . | Coventry. | ( „ ). |
| 1601-2. June 4, '02, . . . | Ipswich. | ( „ ). |
| June 9, '02, . . . . | Norwich. | ( „ ). |
| 1602-3. Dec. 20, '02–Nov. 27, '03, | Coventry. | ( „ ). |
| 1603-4. [Jan. 10, '04]–Nov. 22, '04. . . . . | Coventry. | ( „ ). |
| 1606-7. '07, . . . . | Barnstaple. | ( „ ). |
| Nov. 3, '06–Nov. 25, '07, . | Coventry. | ( „ ). |
| 1607-8. Dec., '07, . . . | Coventry. | ( „ ). |
| 1608-9. May 1, '09, . . | Louth. | ( „ ). |
| May 24, '09, . . . | Coventry. | ( „ ). |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1609. Dec. 2, . . . | Gawthorpe Hall, Lancs. | | (Earl of Derby's players). |
| 1611-12. Aug. 12, 1612, . . | Gawthorpe Hall, Lancs. | ( ,, ). | |
| Nov. 27, '11–Nov. 25, '12, . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). | |
| 1612. December, . . . | Gawthorpe Hall, Lancs. | ( ,, ). | |
| 1613. September, . . . | Gawthorpe Hall, Lancs. | | (Earl of Derby's [players]).[3] |
| 1615-16. May 14, '16, . . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). | |
| 1617. March 18, . . . | Gawthorpe Hall, Lancs. | ( ,, ). | |

NOTES TO PROVINCIAL VISITS

[1] Cf. above, 291 *n.*

[2] The second performance at Coventry this year is evidently considerably later than the first, as there are several entries between them, cf. ii. 241. Probably Derby's men returned to Coventry after visiting Leicester.

[3] Cf. ii. 395.

## III

## 1, LORD RICH'S COMPANY

THE first appearance of a Lord Rich's company of players was at Ipswich, on May 3, 1564. At that time Sir Richard Rich, the notorious Lord Chancellor of 1547-1551, was Baron Rich. He died on June 12, 1567, and his players seem to have immediately passed under the patronage of his successor, Robert Rich, for on July 31, 1567, a Lord Rich's company visited Ipswich. During the Christmas season of 1568 this company acted at Court. They again acted at Court on Shrove Sunday, 1570.[1] Soon afterwards these players must have dispersed or passed under other patronage, for nothing more is heard of a Lord Rich's company till 1587-[9].[2]

[1] Mr. Fleay dates this company 1568-70 (*Stage*, 35), and 1567-70 (*Stage*, 369). So far as concerns the Company's appearances at Court the former of these datings is the correct one.

[2] Cf. 2, Lord Rich company, ii. 92-93.

### COURT PERFORMANCES

(Patron, Robert Rich, Baron Rich, 1567, June 12–1581, Feb. 27.)

| | |
|---|---|
| 1568. Dec. 26, . . . | (Lord Rich's players).[1] |
| 1570. Feb. 5, . . . | ( ,, ).[2] |

[1] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxix. On Dec. 28, 1569, Lord Rich's players were paid £6, 13s. 4d. for presenting a play before the Queen at Hampton Court on 'St Stevens daye at night.'

[2] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxix. On Feb 7, 1570, Lord Rich's players were paid £6, 13s. 4d. for presenting a play before the Queen at Hampton Court on 'Shroue Sondaye at nyghte laste paste.'

## PROVINCIAL VISITS

(Patron, Sir Richard Rich, Baron Rich, 1547, Feb. 16–1567, June 12.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1563-4. May 3, '64, . . | Ipswich. | (Lord Rich's players). |
| 1565. April 6, . . . . | York. | ( „ ). |

(Patron, Robert Rich, Baron Rich, 1567, June 12–1581, Feb. 27.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1566-7. July 31, '67, . . | Ipswich. | (Lord Rich's players). |
| 1569-70. Autumn, '69, . . | Canterbury. | ( „ ). |

## IV

## 2, LORD CLINTON, EARL OF LINCOLN'S COMPANY[1]

After the disappearance of the 1, Lord Clinton company in 1548-9, there is no mention of any players under this patronage till 1566-7, when such a company visited Winchester. As its patron, Edward Clinton, was Lord Admiral of England from 1558 to 1585, the company was on this occasion called the Lord Admiral's players. The next mention of a Lord Clinton's company occurs in the Revels Accounts for January 3, 1574, when they performed at Court, *Herpetulus the Blue Knight and Probia.* This company was under the patronage of Henry Clinton, who was styled Lord Clinton from 1572 to 1585, his father Edward Clinton having been created Earl of Lincoln in 1572.[2] As there are no records of a company patronised by Edward Clinton after 1566-7, it seems not improbable that the Clinton company of that date passed before 1574 under the patronage of Henry Clinton. This company again appeared at Court during Christmas,

[1] For 1, and 3, Clinton companies, cf. ii. 33-34.

[2] Mr. Fleay states that this company was under the patronage of Edward Clinton (*Stage*, 35), apparently ignoring the fact that Edw. Clinton was not known as Lord Clinton after he was created Earl of Lincoln. Any company of players of which he was patron would certainly be called the Earl of Lincoln's men after 1572. Mr. Fleay also states that this company is 'only heard of from 1574 to 1575' (*Stage*, 35). This is true for London only.

1574-5. About 1576-7 they probably broke up, as, after that date, no Clinton company is mentioned till 1599-1600.[1]

[1] Cf. 3, Clinton company, ii. 33-34.

## COURT PERFORMANCES

(Patron, Henry Clinton, Lord Clinton, 1572-1585, Earl of Lincoln, 1585-1616.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1574. Jan. 3, . . | *Herpetulus the Blue Knight and Probia.* | (Lord Clinton's players).[1] |
| Dec. 27, . . | | ( „ ).[2] |
| 1575. Jan. 2, . . | [*Pretestus*]. | ( „ ).[2] |

[1] Cunningham, *Revels*, 51 ; Chalmers, *Apology*, 394. On Jan. 10, Lord Clinton's men were paid £6, 13s. 4d. for performing this play before the Queen at Whitehall on 'the third of January being the Sunday after new-yeares daye.' Mr. Fleay in his table of Court Performances (*Stage*, 33) apparently conjectures that the plays *Theagines and Chariclea*, and *Fortune* were performed at Court in 1572-3 by Lord Clinton's and Lord Chas. Howard's men. But in the note in which he identifies *Theagines and Chariclea* with the *Queen of Ethiopia*, acted by Lord Chas. Howard's men at Bristol, Sept. 1578, he does not mention Lord Clinton's men as having any connection with either play (*Stage*, 20). There is no evidence to show that either of these plays was ever acted by Lord Clinton's men.

[2] Cunningham, *Revels*, 87, xxx. On Jan. 11, 1575, Lord Clinton's men were paid £6, 13s. 4d. for presenting a play before the Queen 'upon St. Johns day last,' and £6, 13s. 4d. for a play upon 'Sonday the second of Januar 1574.' At one of these performances the play was *Pretestus*.

## PROVINCIAL VISITS

(Patron, Edw. Clinton, Lord Clinton, 1517-1572, Earl of Lincoln, 1572-1585, Lord Admiral, 1558-1585.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1566-7, . . . . . | Winchester. | (Lord Admiral's players). |

(Patron, Henry Clinton, Lord Clinton, 1572-1585, Earl of Lincoln, 1585-1616.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1576-7. June 24, '77, . . | Southampton. | (Lord Clinton's players). |
| July, '77, . . . . | Bristol. | ( „ ). |
| Oct. 25, '76–Nov. 23, '77, . | Coventry. | ( „ ). |

## V

## 2, EARL OF SUSSEX—2, LORD CHAMBERLAIN'S COMPANY

On Feb. 17, 1557, Thomas Radclyffe became Earl of Sussex. There are no records of a company under his patronage till March 16, 1569, when the Earl of Sussex's men played at Nottingham. This company had probably been organised shortly before this performance. Whether it contained any of the players of the former Sussex company is not known.[1] When in 1569-70 they played at Ludlow, it is noted that they numbered six men.[2] From 1569 to 1583, when Thomas Radclyffe died, the company often performed in the provinces, and from 1577 to 1583 it frequently acted at Court. As the Earl of Sussex was Lord Chamberlain from July 13, 1572, till his death on June 9, 1583, his company appeared during those years as the Lord Chamberlain's men, except from *c.* April 24, 1574, to *c.* Feb. 2, 1577, when Lord Charles Howard was acting Lord Chamberlain.[3]

After the death of Thomas Radclyffe, his company of players seems to have passed under the patronage

[1] Mr. Fleay knows nothing of this company (*Stage*, 369). Cf. for 1, Sussex-1, Chamb. company, ii. 45-46.

[2] Cf. Appendix, p. 324.

[3] E. K. Chambers, *Elizabethan Lord Chamberlains*, Malone Soc. Pub., i. 31-42; *Complete Peerage*, vii. 336.

of his successor, Henry Radclyffe, for on May 15, 1585, the Earl of Sussex's men played at Dover. From this date till Dec. 14, 1593, when Henry Radclyffe died, his company acted frequently in the provinces.[1] On Jan. 2, 1592, these men acted at Court. Apart from this, they are not mentioned as acting in London. In 1590-1 they acted at Gloucester with the Queen's men.[2]

On December 14, 1593, Henry Radclyffe died, and was succeeded by Robert Radclyffe, who held the title till Sept. 22, 1629, the time of his death. The Sussex company must have passed immediately under the patronage of the new Earl, for on Dec. 27, 1593, they began playing at the Rose as the Earl of Sussex's men. Here they continued to act till Feb. 6, 1594, when they seem to have left the Rose, reappearing there from April 1 to April 8, 1594.[3] After

[1] Mr. Fleay supposes that the company of Thomas Radclyffe, Earl of Sussex, passed, on his death in June, 1583, under the patronage of Edward de Vere, Earl of Oxford (*Stage*, 35). His only evidence for this conjecture is that from 1583 to 1592 he finds no mention of an Earl of Sussex's company in London, and in December, 1584, finds an Earl of Oxford's company acting at Court, and again mentioned in 1587 as one of the London companies (*Stage*, 33, 80). But as the provincial records show, Thomas Radclyffe's company passed under the patronage of his successor Henry Radclyffe, Earl of Sussex, in 1583. As Mr. Fleay thinks Thomas Radclyffe's men became the Earl of Oxford's men in 1583, he is driven to conjecture the formation of a new Earl of Sussex's company, *c.* 1591, to account for their appearance at Court on Jan. 2, 1592 (*Stage*, 369). This is, of course, wrong, for Sussex's men continued to act in the provinces from 1583 till after 1592. Concerning this 1591 Sussex company of Mr. Fleay's, he offers the further unfounded conjectures 'as to the Earl of Sussex' men (Henry Ratcliffe's), they probably arose when Paul's Children were inhibited in 1591, and acted at the same play-place in or near Paul's Churchyard' (*Stage*, 86).

[2] Cf. ii. 284.

[3] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 16-17. Mr. Fleay in his Index Lists dates the Sussex company 1591-1593, *i.e.* to the death of Henry Radclyffe (*Stage*, 369), though on page 145 (*Stage*), in his table of the occupation of the theatres, he enters them as playing at the Rose till April 8, 1594.

this the Sussex company is not heard of in London. From 1593 to 1602-3 these men are not mentioned in the provincial records. In 1602-3 they visited Coventry, and from that date till 1615, when they finally disappeared, they occasionally played in the provincial towns.

Concerning the actors of this Sussex company nothing is certainly known, but there is a probability that John Taylor and Will Perkins mentioned in *George-a-Greene*, *The Pinner of Wakefield*, were actors and members of it. *George-a-Greene* was acted by the Earl of Sussex's company during December and January, 1593-4,[1] and, so far as is known, never belonged to any other company.[2] The text of this play which has come down to us has been thus described :—'The play has been not only very badly printed, the printer being uncertain what should be presented as prose and what as verse, but it has evidently been printed from a confused and mutilated copy, etc. In the third scene of the fourth act there is hopeless confusion, Wakefield having been put for Bradford. Passages are constantly occurring, both in the prose portions as well as the verse, which have evidently been curtailed.'[3] Into such a text, probably made

[1] *Diary*, ed. Greg, 16.

[2] Mr. Fleay supposes that *George-a-Greene* was originally a Queen's play (*Drama*, i. 264). His reason for this is that Greene, who seems to have written several plays for the Queen's men, is nowhere else mentioned as writing for Sussex's men (*Drama*, i. 262-265). But the extremely close connection of the Queen's and Sussex's men during 1591-1594, renders it probable that during its period Greene might write for Sussex's men as well as the Queen's (cf. above, 13).

[3] *Plays and Poems of Robert Greene*, etc., ed. J. Churton Collins, 1905, ii. 163.

up from an abridged acting copy, or partly from notes taken in the theatre, it is likely enough for actors' names to appear. The name John Taylor occurs in Sc. 1, line 15. In the stage directions is the name John, but when the Earl of Kendal addresses John, he does so as follows :—'Say, John Taylor, what news with King James ?'[1] Such a use of a servant's full name is unusual and uncalled for. The name Will Perkins, which occurs in Sc. 13, is used in the same peculiar way :—'*Geo.* A pot! you slave, we will have a hundred. Here, Will Perkins, take my purse, fetch me a stand of ale, etc.'[2] Will Perkins does not appear in the stage directions. Considering the state of the text, and the manner in which the names John Taylor and Will Perkins occur in it, it is very probable that they belong to actors. If so, they were almost surely members of the second Sussex company.[3]

[1] *Dramatic Works of Robert Greene*, ed. Alex. Dyce, 1831, 200 ; cf. also Fleay, *Drama*, i. 264.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] Collier by a forgery (*Memoirs of E. Alleyn*, 45 ; *Catalogue of MSS. at Dulwich College*, G. F. Warner, 14-15) tried to show that Lodge was a member of Sussex's company. But there is no authentic evidence to show that Lodge was ever a player as well as a dramatist.

The vexed question of how Sussex's men came to possess *Titus Andronicus*, who the author of that play was, etc., cannot be discussed here. It is worth noting, however, that Mr. Fleay's description of Sussex's men as 'these strollers,' and his opinion that neither Kyd nor Marlowe would have written for such a company (*Drama*, ii. 299) must be qualified. Sussex's company was of considerable importance, or they would not have acted for Henslowe from Dec., 1593, to Feb., 1594, and again from April 4 to April 8, 1594, and at Court in 1592. Moreover, it is highly probable that this company acted in London at other times than those mentioned above, though no records of such performances have been preserved. Mr. Fleay's custom of ignoring the travelling companies is misleading, for the provinces had their favourite companies as well as London, and Sussex's men were among the most popular with them.

## COURT PERFORMANCES

(Patron, Thomas Radclyffe, Earl of Sussex, 1557, Feb. 17–1583, June 9; Lord Chamberlain, 1572, July 13–1583, June 9, except 1574, *c.* April 24–1577, Feb. 2, when Lord Chas. Howard was acting Chamberlain.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1577. Feb. 2, . . | *The History of the Cenofalls.* | (Lord Chamberlain's players).[1] |
| 1578. Feb. 2, . . | | ( ,, ).[2] |
| Dec. 28, . . | *A History of the Crueltie of a Stepmother.* | ( ,, ).[3] |
| 1579. March 3, . | *The History of Murderous Michael.* | ( ,, ).[4] |
| [Xmas.], . . | | ( ,, ).[5] |
| 1580. Feb. 2, . . | *History of Portio and Demorantes.* | ( ,, ).[6] |
| Feb. 16, . . | *History of Serpedon.* | ( ,, ).[7] |
| Dec. 27, . . | | (Earl of Sussex's players).[8] |
| Feb. 2, . . | | ( ,, ).[9] |
| 1583. Jan. 6, . . | *A History of Ferrar.* | (Lord Chamberlain's players).[10] |
| 1592. Jan. 2, . . | | (Earl of Sussex's players).[11] |

### NOTES TO COURT PERFORMANCES

[1] Cunningham, *Revels*, 102; Chalmers, *Apology*, 396. The Council Registers state that on Feb. 3, 1577, the Earl of Sussex's men were paid £6, 13s. 4d. and given a reward of £10 for presenting a play before her Majesty 'on Candlemas-day last.' As this payment corresponds to the performance of *The History of Cenofalls*, at Hampton Court on 'Candlemas day at night,' by the Lord Chamberlain's men, it shows that at this time Sussex was again acting as Lord Chamberlain.

[2] Chalmers, *Apology*, 396. On March 14, 1578, the Lord Chamberlain's men were paid £10 for performing a play before the Queen on 'Candlemas day last.' Mr. Fleay assigns this performance to the Lord Chas. Howard's men, on what evidence does not appear (*Stage*, 26, 33).

[3] Cunningham, *Revels*, 125; Chalmers, *Apology*, 396. On Jan. 16, 1579, the Lord Chamberlain's men were paid for this play. It was performed at Richmond on 'Innocents daie at night.'

[4] Cunningham, *Revels*, 143; Chalmers, *Apology*, 396. On March 13, 1579, the Lord Chamberlain's men were paid £6, 13s. 4d., and given a reward of £3, 6s. 8d. for playing *Murderous Michael* before the Queen on 'Shrovetuesday' at Whitehall.

[5] Chalmers, *Apology*, 397. On Jan. 25, 1580, the Lord Chamberlain's men were paid £10 for a play presented before the Queen.

[6] Cunningham, *Revels*, 155; Chalmers, *Apology*, 397. On Feb. 23, 1580, the Lord Chamberlain's men were paid £6, 13s. 4d., and given a reward of £3, 6s. 8d. for presenting *The History of Portio and Demorantes* before the Queen at Whitehall on 'Candlemas-day.'

[7] Cunningham, *Revels*, 155-156; Chalmers, *Apology*, 397. On Feb. 23, 1580, the Lord Chamberlain's men were paid £6, 13s. 4d. and given a reward of £3, 6s. 8d. for presenting *The History of Serpedon* before the Queen at Whitehall, on 'Shrove-tuesday.'

[8] Cunningham, *Revels*, 167; Chalmers, *Apology*, 398. On Jan. 20, 1581, the Earl of Sussex's men were paid £10 for playing before the Queen on 'St. John's day at night.'

[9] Cunningham, *Revels*, 108; Chalmers, *Apology*, 398. The Council Register states that on Feb. 13, 1581, the Lord Chamberlain's servants were paid £6, 13s. 4d. and given a reward of £3, 6s. 8d. for presenting a play before the Queen on 'Candlemas-day.' As the Revels Accounts give this performance to 'the Earle of Sussex' men,' it shows that Sussex was still Chamberlain.

[10] Cunningham, *Revels*, 177. This performance was before the Queen at Windsor on 'Twelfdaie at night.' The Council Registers record no payment for it.

[11] Chalmers, *Apology*, 400. On Feb. 20, 1592, the Earl of Sussex's men were paid £10 for a play before the Queen 'on Sunday after New Year's day, the 2d of January last.'

## PROVINCIAL VISITS

(Patron, Thomas Radclyffe, styled Viscount Fitzwalter, 1542, Nov. 27–1557, Feb. 17; Earl of Sussex, 1557, Feb. 17—1583, June 9; Lord Chamberlain, 1572, July 13–1583, June 9, except 1574, *c* April 24–1577, Feb. 2, when Lord Chas. Howard was acting Chamberlain.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1568-9. March 16, '69, . . | Nottingham. | (Earl of Sussex's players). |
| Summer, '69, . . . | Canterbury. | ( ,, ). |
| | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| 1569-70. August, '70, . . | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |
| | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| | Ludlow. | ( ,, ). |
| 1570-71. Nov. 1, '70, . . | Canterbury. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov., '70, . . . . | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| 1571-2. [After July 15, '72], . | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |
| 1572-3. [May], '72–May 20, '73, | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| *c.* end of March, '73, . . | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| April 3, '73, . . . | Gloucester. | (Earl of Sussex's players). |
| July, '73, . . . . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| Sept. 4, '73, . . . | Nottingham. | ( ,, ). |
| 1573-4. [Sept.–Xmas, '73], . | Canterbury. | (Lord Chamberlain's players). |
| | Leicester. | (Earl of Sussex's players). |
| 1574-5, . . . . . | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| Sept. 10, '75, . . . | Nottingham. | ( ,, ). |
| 1575-6. July 25, '76, . . | Abingdon. | ( ,, ). |
| | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| 1576-7. June 22, '76–June 1, '77, | Bath. | (Lord Chamberlain's players). |
| May 30, '77, . . . | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |
| Oct. 25, '76–Nov. 23, '77, . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| Aug. 31, '77, . . . | Nottingham. | (Earl of Sussex's players). |
| 1577-8. June 1, '77–June 30, '78, | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| 1578-9. July 11, '78–June 9, '79, | Bath. | (Lord Chamberlain's players). |
| *c.* end of Oct., '78, . . | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |
| 1580-1. Sept. 14, '81, . . | Nottingham. | ( ,, ). |
| 1581-2, . . . . . | Southampton. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 15, '81–Nov. 8, '82, . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| 1582-3. Nov. 8, '82–Nov. 26, '83, | Coventry. | (Earl of Sussex's players). |

(Patron, Henry Radclyffe, Earl of Sussex, 1583, June 9–1593, Dec. 14.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1584-5. May 15, '85, . . | Dover. | (Earl of Sussex's players). |
| | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| 1585-6. July 22, '85, . . | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 30, '85–Nov. 15, '86, . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| Feb. 19–March 15, '86, . | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| March 5, '86, . . . | Southampton. | ( ,, ). |
| May, '86, . . . . | Bath. | ( ,, ). |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Gloucester. | (Earl of Sussex's players.) |
| Nov. 30, '85–Nov. 15, '86, | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| 1586-7. *c.* Jan. 1, '87, | Southampton. | ( ,, ). |
| | Exeter. | ( ,, ). |
| [After May 26, '87], | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |
| [Jan.-July, '87], | Leicester. | (Countess of Sussex's players). |
| Sept., '87, | Coventry. | (Earl of Sussex's players). |
| [After Sept. 9, '87], | York. | ( ,, ). |
| 1587-8. April 18, '88, | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |
| June 20, '89, | York. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 14, '87–Dec. 4, '88, | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| Sept. 17, '88, | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| July 13, '87–June 18, '88, | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| | Southampton. | ( ,, ). |
| 1588-9. Oct. 5, '88, | Canterbury. | ( ,, ). |
| '89, | Faversham. | ( ,, ). |
| Feb. 17, '89, | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| March 1, '89, | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |
| March 8, ['89], | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| Sept. 2, '89, | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| | Exeter. | ( ,, ). |
| 1589-90. Nov. 19, '89, | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| Feb. 17, '90, | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |
| Feb. 28, '90, | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| 1590-91. June 5, '91, | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| Aug. 11, '91, | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| 1592-3, | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |
| August, '93, | York, | ( ,, ). |
| 1593-4. Dec. 7, '93, | Winchester. | ( ,, ). |

(Patron, Robert Radclyffe, Earl of Sussex, 1593, Dec. 14–1629, Sept. 22.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1602-3. Dec. 20, '02–Nov. 27, '03, | Coventry. | (Earl of Sussex's players). |
| 1606-7. Nov. 1–Nov. 29, '06, | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| 1607-8. *c.* Michaelmas, 1608, | Canterbury. | ( ,, ). |
| 1608-9, | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| 1615. August 31, | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |

## VI

## SIR ROBERT LANE'S COMPANY

In August, 1570, Sir Robert Lane's men played at Bristol. This is the only known appearance of this company in the provinces. During 1571 and 1572-3 they acted at Court. The only actors who are mentioned as Sir Robert Lane's players are Lawrence and John Dutton. These men probably joined the Earl of Warwick's company in 1574 or early in 1575. As Lane's men disappear after 1572-3, the company was most likely disbanded between that date and the time when the Duttons joined Warwick's men.[1]

[1] For a discussion of Mr. Fleay's opinions about Sir Robert Lane's men, cf. below, 310 *n.* 3.

### COURT PERFORMANCES

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1571. Dec. 27, . | *Lady Barbara.* | (Sir Robert Lane's men).[1] |
| 1572. Feb. 17, . | *Cloridon and Radiamanta.* | ( ,, ).[2] |
| 1572-3, . . . | | ( ,, ).[3] |

### NOTES TO COURT PERFORMANCES

[1] Cunningham, *Revels*, 13. There can be little doubt that the payments for 1572-3 in the Council Registers (Chalmers, *Apology*, 394, 360) are wrongly dated, and are really the payments for 1571-2, because they agree much more closely with the 1571-2 list of plays in the Revels accounts than with those of 1572-3 (cf. Fleay, *Stage*, 18-20). This being the case, the payment for *Lady Barbara* seems to have been made 'to Lawrence Dutton and his fellows, servants to Sir Robert Lane Knight,' on Jan. 12, 1573. The amount was £6, 13s. 4d.

[2] Cunningham, *Revels*, 13; Chalmers, *Apology*, 394. On Feb. 29, 1572

(1573, Council Registers), Lawrence Dutton and his fellows were paid £13, 6s. 8d. for presenting a play before the Queen on Shrove-Sunday at night.

[3] Cunningham, *Revels*, 34-36. Mr. Fleay enters this play to Warwick's men, considering for the moment that the Duttons had at the time of its performance left Lane's men for Warwick's (*Stage*, 33). Before discussing this point, it is necessary to state that Mr. Fleay's dates for Sir Robert Lane's men are far from consistent. On page 369 he dates this company 1571-1572. On page 36 he says, 'Sir Robert Rich's players, 1568-1570, were succeeded by Sir Robert Lane's, 1571-1573, of whom the chief were Lawrence and John Dutton. They most likely broke in 1574, and the Duttons formed a company for the Earl of Warwick.' Here then are 1572, 1573, and 1574 offered as the dates of the dissolution of Sir Robert Lane's men. Concerning the connection of the Duttons with Sir Robert Lane's and Warwick's men Mr. Fleay asserts that John Dutton was not a member of Sir Robert Lane's company (*Stage*, 372 ; above, 287 *n.* 1). This is a direct contradiction of his statement on page 35. Concerning the performance of these men at Court occur the following statements : '1572, Dec. 26—To Laurence Dutton for Sir Ro. Lane's men for a play on St. Stephen's day' (*Stage*, 19), and 'The men of [L. Warwick] "under the Duttons." This company was probably set up when Warwick was sworn Privy Councillor in 1572 (Nicols, iii. 39)' (*Stage*, 20). Here is the only evidence Mr. Fleay has to offer for supposing that Sir Robert Lane's men broke up in 1572, after Dec. 26. It is flimsy in the extreme, for the date of Warwick's being sworn Privy Councillor is doubtful (*Complete Peerage* and *Dict. Nat. Biog.* give 1573), and even if it be 1572, there seems little connection between being sworn a Privy Councillor and desiring a new company of players. There is no traceable connection between the Duttons and Warwick's men till 1574-5, when the new Warwick company under the Duttons was probably formed (cf. above, 285-286).

## VII

## EARL OF ESSEX—COUNTESS OF ESSEX—VISCOUNT HEREFORD'S COMPANY

An Earl of Essex's company of players is first heard of in 1572-3, when they acted at Bath, Gloucester, and Nottingham. At this time Walter Devereux, Viscount Hereford, was Earl of Essex, having been so created on May 4, 1572. From 1572-3 till Sept. 22, 1576, when Walter Devereux died, there are frequent notices of this company in the provinces.[1]

After the death of Walter Devereux his company continued to enjoy the Essex patronage, but probably because his successor, Robert Devereux, was a boy of nine years, the company was known from Sept. 22, 1576 to 1580, both as the Earl of Essex's players and the Countess of Essex's players. The Countess of Essex was Lettice, eldest daughter of Sir Francis Knollys. Even after Sept. 21, 1578, when she married Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, the company appeared a few times as the Countess of Essex's players. In such cases, either the town chamberlains made a mistake, or the company chose, for some reason, to be known by that title. After

[1] Walter Devereux, Earl of Essex, had also a company of musicians in his patronage (cf. ii. 236). Like the players they were continued in the Essex patronage under Robert Devereux, for they are mentioned in the Coventry records for 1577.

1580 they never appeared as the Countess of Essex's players.

The only recorded appearance of this company in London was in 1578, when on Dec. 24 the Privy Council required the Lord Mayor 'to suffer the children of her Majesty's chapel, the servants of the Lord Chamberlain,[1] of the Earl of Warwick, of the Earl of Leicester, of the Earl of Essex, and the children of Paul's, and no companies else, to exercise plays within the city; whom their Lordships have only allowed thereunto, by reason that *the companies aforenamed* are appointed to play this Christmas before her Majesty.'[2] There is no record, however, of the Earl of Essex's men ever performing at Court.

In June, 1585, the Earl of Essex's men, on being refused permission to play in Norwich, bade defiance to the town authorities and played at Thorpe. In consequence of this, on June 26 the Mayor's Court of Norwich, which had granted the players a reward on condition that they should not play, enacted 'yf they shall hereafter com to this citie they shall neu^r^ have reward of this citie.'[3] But by 1589-90 this enactment seems to have been forgotten, for in that year the Earl of Essex's players were granted a reward of 20s. 'by Mr. Mayors comanndement.'[4]

These players do not seem to have relied solely on their acting for popularity, for in the Coventry records of 1589–90 occurs the following entry:—'Given to the Earle of Essex [players] & the turk, xl^s^.'[5] In all probability 'the turk' was a tumbler

[1] *I.e.* Thomas Ratcliffe, Earl of Sussex (cf. above, 301).
[2] Chalmers, *Apology*, 373.
[3] Cf. ii. 336.
[4] *Ibid.*, 367.
[5] *Ibid.*, 239.

or juggler, and the amount of the reward would seem to indicate that his efforts were duly appreciated.

In 1590-91 the Earl of Essex's players joined forces with the Queen's men for a performance at Faversham. For this, these companies were given a reward of £1, though earlier in the year both companies had received rewards from the corporation.[1]

About 1596-7 the Earl of Essex seems to have transferred his company to the patronage of his son Robert Devereux, who was styled Viscount Hereford from his birth *c.* Jan. 22, 1591, till April 18, 1604, when he became Earl of Essex, for from that date nothing further is heard of an Earl of Essex's company, and a Hereford's company is frequently mentioned. On Feb. 25, 1601, Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex, was beheaded for high treason and all his honours forfeited. Nevertheless his son, Robert Devereux, continued to be styled Viscount Hereford till April 18, 1604, when he was restored in blood and honours. Although his company of players had a perfect right after that date to style themselves the Earl of Essex's players, they always appeared as the Earl of Hereford's men till 1606-7, when they disappear from the records.[2]

[1] Cf. ii. 274.

[2] For an interesting letter from William Stanley, Earl of Derby, to the Mayor of Chester on Dec. 2, 1606, concerning these players, cf. ii. 234-235

## PROVINCIAL VISITS

(Patron, Walter Devereux, Viscount Hereford, 1558, Sept. 27–1572, May 4; Earl of Essex, 1572, May 4–1576, Sept. 22.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1572-3. [May], '72–May 20, '73, | Bath. | (Earl of Essex's players). |
| July 10, '73, . . . | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| July 25, '73, . . . | Nottingham. | ( ,, ). |
| 1573-4. Aug. 29, '74, . . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| 1574-5. Oct. 15, '74, . . | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| Dec. 2, '74–Nov. 28, '75, . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| 1575-6. Nov. 28, '75–Oct. 25, '76, | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| [After Jan. 1, '76], . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| Sept. 20, '76, . . . | Nottingham. | ( ,, ). |

(Patrons, Robert Devereux, Viscount Hereford, 1572, May 4–1576, Sept. 22; Earl of Essex, 1576, Sept. 22–1601, Feb. 25; and while Robt. Devereux was young, Lettice, Countess of Essex.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1576-7, . . . . . | Oxford. | (Countess of Essex's players). |
| Oct. 25, '76–Nov. 23, '77, . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| 1577-8. Nov. 23, '77–Oct. 22, '78, | Coventry. | (Earl of Essex's players). |
| 1578-9, . . . . . | Oxford. | (Countess of Essex's players). |
| Oct. 22, '78–Nov. 29, '79, . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| 1579-80, . . . . . | Ipswich. | (Earl of Essex's players). |
| | Oxford. | (Countess of Essex's players). |
| 1580, . . . . . | Stratford-on-Avon. | ( ,, ). |
| 1581-2, . . . . . | Exeter. | (Earl of Essex's players). |
| 1582-3. Nov. 8, '82–Nov. 26, '83, | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| 1583-4. Oct. 5, '83, . . . | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| [Before Jan. 20, '84], . . | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 26, '83–Nov. 24, '80, . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| [Before March 6, '84], . . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| March, '84, . . . | York. | ( ,, ). |
| | Shrewsbury. | ( ,, ). |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| July, '84, . . . . | Ludlow. | (Earl of Essex's players). |
| August, '84, . . . | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |
| 1584-5. Nov. 28–Dec. 19, '84, . | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| June 26, '85, . . . | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| 1585-6. March 5–19, '86, . . | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| March 23, '86, . . . | Southampton. | ( ,, ). |
| April, '86, . . . . | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |
| 1585-6, . . . . . | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 30, '85–Nov. 15, '86, . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| [After June 9, '86], . . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |
| 1586-7. Feb. 27, '87, . . | York. | ( ,, ). |
| July 16, '87, . . . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| | Stratford-on-Avon. | ( ,, ). |
| | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| 1587-8. Nov. 14, '87–Dec. 4, '88, | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| [1587], . . . . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| Feb., '88, . . . . | York. | ( ,, ). |
| Bet. Ap. 18–Sept. 14, '88, . | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |
| After Dec. 29, '87, . . | Fordwich. | ( ,, ). |
| | Maidstone. | ( ,, ). |
| 1588-9. Bet. Sept. 28–Oct. 26, '88, | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| 1589-90. Oct. 31, '89, . . | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 17, '89, . . . | Maidstone. | ( ,, ). |
| | Faversham [twice]. | ( ,, ). |
| 1589-90. [Before Feb. 28, '90], . | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 26, '89–Dec. 15, '90, . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| 1590-91. [Before June 2, '91], . | Faversham. | ( ,, ). |
| 1591-2. [June], '91–June 10, '91, | Bath. | (Earl of Hartford's [Herefordshire] players). |
| 1594. August 31, . . . | Smithils (Lancs.). | (Earl of Essex's players). |
| 1595-6. April, '96, . . . | Ludlow. | ( ,, ). |

(Patron, Robert Devereux, styled Viscount Hereford, 1591, *c.* Jan. 22–1604, April 18; Earl of Essex, 1604, April 18–1646.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1596-7. Nov. 1, '96–Dec. 6, '97, . | Coventry. | (Earl of Hartford's [Herefordshire] players). |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1600-1, . . . . . | Ipswich. | (Earl of Herford's [Herford's] players). |
| 1604-5. [After April 8, '05], . | Norwich. | (Earl of Harford's [Herford's] players). |
| [After July 19, '05], . . | Coventry. | (Earl of Herford's players). |
| 1605-6. Dec. 15, '05–Nov. 3, '06, | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| [Before Aug. 28, '06], . . | Leicester. | (Earl of Harford's [Herford's] players). |
| *c.* Dec. 2, '06, . . . | Lathom (Lancs.). | (Earl of Harforth's [Herford's] players). |
| [After Dec. 2, '06], . . | Chester. | ( ,, ). |
| 1606-7. Nov. 3, '06–Nov. 25, '07, | Coventry. | (Earl of Harford's [Herford's] players). |

## VIII

## THE EARL OF HERTFORD'S COMPANY

In the spring of 1582 a company under the patronage of the Earl of Hertford appeared at Canterbury. At this time Sir Edward Seymour, Baron Beauchamp, was Earl of Hertford, which title he held till April 6, 1621. From 1582 to June 2, 1606, his company of players frequently played in the provinces. The only record of these men in London is on Jan. 6, 1592, when they performed before the Queen at Court. On May 13, 1601, the Mayor's Court in Norwich allowed this company to play for three days in that city.[1] On June 17, 1601, the company was again in Norwich and 'were sutors to haue leaue to plaie at the Signe of the Whight Horsse in Tomelland but for this daie.' But their petition was refused, and it was ordered 'that no players or plays be made or vsed in the said house either now or hereafter.'[2] Concerning the construction of this company nothing is known.

[1] Cf. ii. 338.

[2] *Ibid.* For Owen and Blackeney's confusion of this company with that of Lord Beauchamp in 1590-1, cf. Lord Beauchamp's players, ii. 25 *n.*

## COURT PERFORMANCE

1592. Jan. 6, . . . . (Earl of Hertford's players).[1]

[1] Chalmers, *Apology*, 400. The Earl of Hertford's men were paid £10 on Feb. 20, 1592, for a play presented before the Queen on 'Twelfth night last.'

## PROVINCIAL VISITS

(Patron, Sir Edward Seymour, Baron Beauchamp and Earl of Hertford, 1559, Jan. 13–1621, April 6.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1581-2. Spring, '82, . . . | Canterbury. | (Earl of Hertford's players). |
| 1586. [After Aug. 22], . . | Faversham. | ( ,, ). |
| 1586-7, . . . . . | Marlborough. | (Earl of Hertford's 'men' [players]). |
| 1590-1. Nov. 22, '90, . . | Leicester. | (Earl of Hertford's players). |
| 1591-2, . . . . . | Marlborough. | ( ,, ). |
| [After May 5, '92], . . | Southampton. | ( ,, ). |
| 1600-1. May 13, '01, . . | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| June 17, '01, . . . | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| 1601-2. [Before Christmas, '01], . | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| May 8, '02, . . . | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |
| 1605-6. June 2, '06, . . . | Marlborough. | ( ,, ). |

## IX

## 2, LORD HUNSDON—5, LORD CHAMBERLAIN'S COMPANY

After the breaking up of the 1, Lord Hunsdon's company, *c.* 1566-7, no players under the Hunsdon patronage are mentioned till 1582. In July of that year a Lord Hunsdon's company acted at Ludlow. Their patron was Henry Carey, Baron Hunsdon, 1559, Jan. 13–1596, July 23, and Lord Chamberlain, 1585, *c.* July 4–1596, July 23. Notices of this company occur frequently in the provinces till 1589-90, after which nothing is heard of them. On Dec. 27, 1582, they acted *A Comedy of Beauty and Housewifery* before the Queen, at Windsor. In March, 1583, they acted with Lord Morley's men at Bristol. On that occasion the City Chamberlain, in entering his payment to Lord Hunsdon's and Lord Morley's companies, stated that they were 'bothe of one companye.'[1] The two companies being in Bristol at the same time, had no doubt temporarily united forces. They are nowhere else spoken of as being connected. About July 4, 1585, Lord Hunsdon became Lord Chamberlain, and his company assumed that title. As the Lord Chamberlain's men, they acted with the Lord Admiral's men at Court on Jan.

[1] Cf. ii. 216.

6, 1586. The last mention of this company is in 1589-90. Probably between that date and April 16, 1594, they either disbanded or passed under other patronage, for soon after April 16, 1594, the company of Ferdinando Stanley, Lord Strange, became Lord Hunsdon's men.[1] Concerning the actors in Lord Hunsdon's company of *c.* 1582–*c.* 1590-4, nothing is known.[2]

[1] Cf. above, 91.

[2] Henry Carey, Lord Hunsdon, had a company of musicians in his patronage. They visited Coventry in 1574-5, 1578 and 1587. The last entry is interesting. It runs thus,—'and to the lo: chamblayns mucissons that came w$^{th}$ the Judge at the assisses—v$^{s}$.'

## COURT PERFORMANCES

(Patron, Henry Carey, Baron Hunsdon, 1559-1596, Lord Chamberlain, 1585-1596.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1582. Dec. 27, . | *A Comedy of Beauty and Housewifery.* | (Lord Hunsdon's players).[1] |
| 1586. Jan. 6, . . | | (Lord Chamberlain's players).[2] |

[1] Cunningham, *Revels*, 176. This performance was before the Queen at Windsor on St. John's day.

[2] Halliwell-Phillipps, *Illustrations*, 31. On Jan. 31 the Lord Admiral's and Lord Chamberlain's players were paid for a play before the Queen on Twelfth day.

## PROVINCIAL VISITS

(Patron, Henry Carey, Baron Hunsdon, 1559-1596,
Lord Chamberlain, 1585-1596.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1581-2. Last of July, '82, . . | Ludlow. | (Lord Hunsdon's players). |
| 1582-3. March, '83, . . . | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |
| | Doncaster. | ( ,, ). |
| | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| [July, '83], . . . . | Exeter. | ( ,, ). |
| 1583-4. June, '84, . . . | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| 1585-6. Nov. 30, '85–Nov. 15, '86, | Coventry. | (Lord Chamberlain's players) |
| [Before June 9, '86], . . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| 1589-90. Jan. 20, '89–[Jan.], '90, | Maidstone. | ( ,, ). |

## X

## 3, EARL OF ARUNDEL'S COMPANY

In June, 1584, a company of players under the patronage of Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel, was acting in London, probably at the Curtain.[1] They must have left London soon after this, for on July 1 they were at Ipswich. During 1584 they also appeared at Leicester. In 1585-6 they acted at Norwich. By 1589, if not before, this company had probably disbanded or passed under some other patron, for in that year the Earl of Arundel was attainted, and all his honours forfeited. This was the third Earl of Arundel company.[2]

[1] Cf. above, 10.

[2] The first, second, and fourth Arundel companies were purely provincial (cf. ii. 20 f.).

### PROVINCIAL VISITS

(Patron, Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel, 1580, Feb. 24–1589, *d.* Oct. 1595.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1583-4. July 1, '84, . . . | Ipswich. | (Earl of Arundel's players.) |
| | Leicester. | ( „ ). |
| 1585-6, . . . . . | Norwich. | ( „ ). |

# PART IV

# CHILDREN'S COMPANIES

## 1558-1603

# I

## THE CHILDREN OF ST. PAUL'S CHOIR

The Children of Paul's seem to have been favourites of Elizabeth, for when, in April, 1557, she entertained Queen Mary at Hatfield House, she chose this company to perform an after-supper play before Her Majesty,[1] and after her accession to the throne, the first recorded performance before her was on August 7, 1559, at Nonesuch, by the Children of Paul's.[2] From this time till 1581, they played almost yearly before the Court.[3] Their public playing-place was, probably from the first, the courtyard of St. Paul's Cathedral.[4] They sometimes united with the Children of the Chapel for Court performances, as in the case of Lyly's *Alexander and Campaspe*, and *Sapho and Phao*, printed 1584.[5]

In the autumn of 1575, one of Paul's boys was kidnapped, possibly by a rival company, for on Dec. 3 the Privy Council wrote 'A letter to the Master of the Rolls, and Mr. Doctor Wilson; that

[1] Cf. ii. 286. [2] Cf. below, 328. [3] Cf. *Ibid.*

[4] G. P. Baker, *Endymion*, cxiv-cxvi; Mr. Fleay, on quite unconvincing evidence, locates Paul's boys at Blackfriars Inn from 1559-1581 (*Stage*, 36, 40).

[5] Cf. title-pages 1st and 3rd editions of *Alexander and Campaspe*, and 1st edition, *Sapho and Phao*. Mr. Fleay's idea that Paul's boys acted these plays in public, and the Children of the Chapel at Court is extremely far-fetched (*Stage*, 32, 36; *Drama*, ii. 39, 40; Baker, *Endymion*, cxiv).

whereas one of Sebastian's [Wescott's] boys, being one of his principall players, is lately stolen, and conveyed, from him ; they be required to examine such persons as Sebastian holdeth suspected, and to proceed with such as be found faulty according to law and the order of this realm.'[1] Nothing further is recorded about this inquiry.

On Dec. 24, 1578, Paul's boys are mentioned in a letter from the Privy Council to the Lord Mayor as one of the companies to be allowed to play 'within the city,' because they had been appointed to play before the Queen at Christmas.[2]

From Dec. 26, 1581, to Christmas, 1587, Paul's boys did not appear at Court, in London, or the provinces. This almost surely indicates that during these years they were not acting. Probably they had in some way offended the Court, and were in consequence suppressed.[3] As they acted *Sapho and Phao* after Feb. 6, 1582, their suppression cannot precede that date.[4] By 1585 they seem to have regained the Court favour, for, on April 26 of that year, the Queen gave Thomas Gyles, their master, a writ authorising him 'to take up xx. apte and meete children' for the 'Churche of St. Paule.'[5] During 1588-9 and 1590, they again appeared at Court.[6]

By September, 1589, Paul's boys became mixed up in the Martin Marprelate controversy, as is shown by the following remark of Lyly's in *Pappe-with-an-Hatchet* (*c.* Sept., 1589), about the way Martin had

[1] Chalmers, *Apology*, 363 *n*.
[2] Malone by Boswell, iii. 432.
[3] Baker, *Endymion*, cxi f.
[4] *Ibid.*, xl.
[5] Collier, i. 258-259 *n*. ; N. C. Hazlitt, *The English Drama and Stage*, etc., 33-34. This writ makes no exception of the Children of the Chapel, or of any other cathedral or church.
[6] Cf. below, 328.

been caricatured on the stage, 'If it be shewed at Paules it will cost you foure pence.'[1] In 1590 severe measures were taken to stop the controversy; the Marprelate press was seized at Manchester, and Udall and Penry, prominent partisans of the Puritan side, were imprisoned.[2] Not improbably it was on account of their part in this quarrel that Paul's boys were suppressed at about this time. This suppression is definitely referred to by the printer of the October 1591 edition of *Endymion*, who speaks of certain comedies which had come into his hands, 'Since the plays in Paul's were dissolved.'[3] It could not have happened before September 29, 1590, after which date Paul's boys acted at Gloucester.[4] Most likely it occurred soon after Sept. 29, 1590.[5]

Not till 1600 did the Children of Paul's regain the Court favour and reopen 'in Pauls.' During that year they acted *Jack Drum's Entertainment*,[6] and on Jan. 1, 1601, they played at Court. On March 11, 1601, the plays in Paul's were among those ordered by the Privy Council 'to be utterly suppressed during this time of Lent.'[7] From this time till 1603, they probably performed without interruption, though they did not again appear at Court.

[1] G. Saintsbury, *Pappe-with-an-Hatchet*, 73.
[2] Baker, *Endymion*, clxviii, clxix.
[3] Arber, *English Reprints, Lyly*.
[4] Cf. below, 330.
[5] For a discussion of the possibility that Paul's boys acted at Croydon in 1591-2, cf. below, 337 *n*.
[6] *Drama*, ii. 72-75.
[7] Collier, i. 299.

## COURT PERFORMANCES

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1559. Aug. 7, . . . | | (The Children of Paul's).[1] |
| 1560-61. *c.* Xmas, . . . | | ( „ ).[2] |
| 1561-2, . . . . . | | ( „ ).[3] |
| 1562-3, . . . . . | | ( „ ).[4] |
| 1563-4. *c.* Xmas, . . . | | ( „ ).[5] |
| 1564-5. *c.* Xmas, . . . | | ( „ ).[6] |
| 1565. Feb. 2, . . . . | | ( „ ).[7] |
| 1566-7. Xmas, . . . | Two plays. | ( „ ).[8] |
| 1569. Jan. 1, . . . . | | ( „ ).[9] |
| 1571. Dec. 28, . . . | *Iphigenia.* | ( „ ).[10] |
| 1572-3, . . . . . | | ( „ ).[11] |
| 1573. Dec. 27, . . . | *Alcmeon.* | ( „ ).[12] |
| 1575. Feb. 2, . . . . | | ( „ ).[13] |
| 1576. Jan. 6, . . . . | | ( „ ).[14] |
| 1577. Jan. 1, . . . . | *History of Error.* | ( „ ).[15] |
| Feb. 19, . . . . | *History of Titus and Gisippus.* | ( „ ).[16] |
| 1579. Jan. 4, . . . . | *The Marriage of Mind and Measure.* | ( „ ).[17] |
| 1580. Jan. 3, . . . . | *History of Scipio Africanus.* | ( „ ).[18] |
| 1581. Jan. 6, . . . . | *Pompey.* | ( „ ).[19] |
| Dec. 26, . . . . | | ( „ ).[20] |
| 1588. Feb. 18, . . . | | ( „ ).[21] |
| 1588-9. *c.* Xmas, . . . | | ( „ ).[22] |
| 1590. Jan. 1, . . . . | | ( „ ).[23] |
| Jan. 4, . . . . | | ( „ ).[23] |
| Jan. 6, . . . . | | ( „ ).[23] |
| 1601. Jan. 1, . . . . | | ( „ ).[24] |

### NOTES TO COURT PERFORMANCES

[1] Nichols, *Progresses*, i. 74. Collier (i. 169 *n.*) wrongly gives Aug. 5 as the date and Eltham as the place. The performance was at Nonesuch, and the children were under their master, Sebastian Westcott. Mr. Fleay conjectures that the play was *Nice Wanton* (*Stage*, 57-58).

[2] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxvii. On Jan. 21, 1561, Sebastian Westcott was paid £6, 13s. 4d. for a play by Paul's boys before the Queen 'in Christmas.'

[3] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxvii. On March 9, 1562, Sebastian Westcott was paid £6, 13s. 4d. for a play by Paul's boys before the Queen. Mr. Fleay seems to have confused these two payments (*Stage*, 15, 32). At one of these performances he conjectures *Ralph Royster* was performed (*Stage*, 59).

[4] Chalmers, *Apology*, 360. On Jan. 10, 1563, Sebastian Westcott was paid £6, 13s. 4d. for a play by the Children of Paul's. Mr. Fleay conjectures the play was *Like will to Like* (*Stage*, 59-60).

[5] Chalmers, *Apology*, 356; Collier, i. 183. A payment of £8, 6s. 8d. was made in January for certain expenses connected with performances by the Children of Westminster and St. Paul's.

[6] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxviii; Chalmers, *Apology*, 360. On Jan. 18, 1565, Sebastian Westcott was paid £6, 13s. 4d. for a play by Paul's boys before the Queen at Christmas.

[7] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxviii. On March 9, 1565, Sebastian Westcott was paid £6, 13s. 4d. for a play before the Queen on 'Candlemas day,' by the Children of Paul's.

[8] Chalmers, *Apology*, 360. On Jan. 12, 1567, Sebastian Westcott was paid £13, 6s. 8d. for two plays by Paul's boys 'on Christmas last.' Mr. Fleay omits this entry (*Stage*, 17, 32).

[9] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxix. For a play on 'New yeres day at night,' Sebastian Westcott received £6, 13s. 4d. The date of payment is not given.

[10] Cunningham, *Revels*, 13; Chalmers, *Apology*, 360. Mr. Fleay is undoubtedly correct in pointing out that the payment of £6, 13s. 4d., dated Jan. 12, 1573, for a play by Paul's boys 'on New Year's day' last, really refers to the performance on Innocent's day (*Stage*, 18-19).

[11] Cunningham, *Revels*, 41. Among the Revels payments for 1572-3 is the following:—'ij Squirts for the playe of the children of powles; viii$^{s}$.'

[12] Cunningham, *Revels*, 51; Chalmers, *Apology*, 360. This play was performed by Paul's boys at Whitehall on 'Saint Johns Daye at nighte.' On Jan. 10, 1574, Sebastian Westcott was paid £6, 13s. 4d. for a play 'at Christmas last,' no doubt *Alcmeon*.

[13] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxi. On Feb. 16, 1575, Sebastian Westcott was paid £13, 6s. 8d. for a play by Paul's boys before the Queen on 'Candlemas day at night.'

[14] Chalmers, *Apology*, 361. On Jan. 7, 1576, Sebastian [Westcott] was paid £10 for a play at Court by Paul's boys on 'Twelfth day last.'

[15] Cunningham, *Revels*, 102; Chalmers, *Apology*, 361. *The History of Error* was played at Hampton Court on New Year's day at night by the Children of Paul's. For this performance they were paid on January 20, 1577. They received £6, 13s. 4d. and a reward of £2, 10s.

[16] Cunningham, *Revels*, 114, 120; Chalmers, *Apology*, 361. This performance was at Whitehall on 'Shrovetuysdaie at night.' It was paid for on Feb. 20, 1577, the company receiving £6, 13s. 4d., plus a reward of 5 marks.

[17] Cunningham, *Revels*, 125; Chalmers, *Apology*, 361. This play was

given on 'the sondaie next after Newyeres daie.' It was paid for on Jan. 16, 1579.

[18] Cunningham, *Revels*, 155; Chalmers, *Apology*, 362. This performance was at Whitehall 'the sondaye night after newe yeares daie.' For it Paul's boys received £10 on Jan. 25, 1580 (Jan. 29 is wrongly given by Fleay, *Stage*, 28).

[19] Cunningham, *Revels*, 167; Chalmers, *Apology*, 362. This play was given at Whitehall on 'twelfnighte.' The company received £10 for it on Jan 30, 1581.

[20] Chalmers, *Apology*, 362. On April 24, 1582, Paul's boys were paid £10 for a play given on 'St. Stephen's day last.'

[21] Cunningham, *Revels*, 198; Chalmers, *Apology*, 362. On Shrove Sunday Paul's boys performed before the Queen at Greenwich. For this Thomas Gyles their master was paid £10 on April 9.

[22] Chalmers, *Apology*, 362. On March 23, 1589, Thomas Gyles was paid £30 for 'sundry' [three at £10 each] 'plays in the Christmas holydays,' by Paul's boys.

[23] Chalmers, *Apology*, 362. On March 10, 1590, Paul's boys were paid £20 and given a reward of £10 for 'three plays on Sunday after Christmas day, New years day, and Twelfth day.'

[24] Chalmers, *Apology*, 363. On June 24, 1601, Edward Piers, master of Paul's boys, was paid 20 marks, and given a reward of 5 marks, for a play on New Year's day.

## PROVINCIAL VISITS

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1557. April, . . . . | Hatfield House. | (The Children of Paul's). |
| Uncertain, . . . . | Hedon (Yorks). | ( ,, ). |
| 1590-1, . . . . . | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |

## II

## THE CHILDREN OF THE CHAPEL ROYAL[1]

THE earliest mention of the Children of the Chapel, after the accession of Queen Elizabeth, is on April 30, 1559, when Richard Bower was continued as their master.[2] There is some likelihood that these boys performed before the Queen on Dec. 31, 1559. If so, they were unfortunate in their play, for it gave such offence that they were not allowed to finish it.[3] They did not again appear at Court till Christmas, 1563-4.[4] Whether or not this performance was also displeasing is doubtful. At any rate their next play at Court was not till 1570. From that year till Dec. 26, 1582, they appeared before the Queen almost yearly.[5] On Dec. 24, 1578, they are mentioned as one of the companies permitted to act 'within the City,' because they had been appointed to play before the Queen at Christmas.[6] After 1582 there

[1] Dr. Charles William Wallace promises us a complete history of this and other children's companies in the light of new documents recently discovered by him. At the time of this writing only the volume dealing with the children of the Chapel at Blackfriars from 1597 to 1603 has appeared.

[2] Collier, i. 175.

[3] Cf. below, 335 *n.* 1.

[4] Mr. Fleay conjectures that *Godly Queen Hester*, published in 1561, 'is beyond doubt a play acted by the Chapel children publicly by way of retaliation for their inhibition at Court in 1560' (*Stage*, 66). His only evidence for this is that in the play Queen Hester has a Chapel Royal, the children of which sing before her (Collier, ii. 181; *Drama*, ii. 295). This evidence does not seem sufficient to justify Mr. Fleay's deduction.

[5] Cf. below, 335.

[6] Malone by Boswell, iii. 432.

are no recorded performances by them in London till 1601, though they acted occasionally in the provinces.[1]

In 1561 Richard Edwards was appointed Master of these children.[2] He was succeeded by William Hunnis in 1566.[3] When Hunnis died in 1597, his position was taken by Nathaniel Gyles.[4]

In Thomas Nash's *Summer's Last Will and Testament*, which was acted in 1592 at Croydon, occur the following actor's names :

Harry Baker.
Dick Huntley.
Ned.
Robert Tay (an adult).[5]

If, as seems probable, this play was performed by the Children of the Chapel, these players must have belonged to that company.[6]

Where the Chapel boys acted till 1597, when they

[1] Cf. below, 337. Mr. Fleay, who has no information about the company from 1583 to 1591, supposes that they were suppressed in 1583 (*Stage*, 368). As there is no definite evidence of such a suppression as in the case of Paul's boys, and as they appeared in 1586-7, 1590-1, and possibly 1592, in the provinces, it is safer to suppose they were acting, though out of favour at Court. Besides, that the company might be acting in London though not appearing at Court, is shown by the fact that though they did not play at Court from 1597-1601 they were acting regularly at Blackfriars (cf. below, 332-333).

[2] *Dic. Nat. Biog.*; Wallace, 65 *n.* Mr. Fleay first gives 1561 as the date of Edward's appointment (*Stage*, 34), then, later, 1559 (*Drama*, i. 163). What authority he has for the second date is not clear. The only evidence seems to be the possibility that Edwards wrote *Misogonus*, and that this play was performed in 1559 by the Children of the Chapel, and so the inference that Edwards was at that time their Master (cf. below, 335 *n.* 1)

[3] Nichols, *Progresses*, i. 489 ; Wallace, 66.

[4] *Dict. Nat. Biog.* ; Wallace, 59.

[5] Hazlitt's *Dodsley*, viii. 17, 59.

[6] Cf. below, 337 *n.*

occupied Blackfriars Theatre, is unknown.[1] On July 15, 1597, Gyles obtained a Patent to take up children for the Queen's Chapel. He then united with James Robinson, Henry Evans, and others, to establish these boys in Burbadge's new theatre in Blackfriars.[2] On Sept. 2, 1600, Richard Burbadge let this building to Henry Evans for twenty-one years from Sept. 29, 1600.[3] Soon after, Evans, Gyles, and Robinson began kidnapping boys for their company. In this way they obtained John Chappell, John Motteram, Nathan Field, Alvery Trussell, Philip Pykman, Thomas Grimes, Salathiel or Salmon Pavy, and Thomas Clifton. When Henry Clifton, the father of Thomas Clifton, learned what had happened to his boy, he went to Blackfriars and demanded his son's release. This, Evans, Gyles, and Robinson refused, and to irritate him, gave the boy a scroll of paper, with a part of one of their plays on it, and commanded him to learn it by heart on pain of a whipping. Not till Henry Clifton obtained a warrant from Sir John Fortescue, one of the Privy Council, did he obtain his son's release.[4] About a year later Evans was censured for this conduct by the Star Chamber, and 'all assureances made to the said Evans concerninge the said house or playes or Interludes' were withdrawn.[5] Sometime before this decree, possibly in anticipation of it,

[1] *Stage*, 127; Wallace, 56-58. Mr. Fleay supposes they acted at the Bell Savage Inn (*Stage*, 39). The evidence for this is quite unconvincing, and it seems more probable that they acted at Blackfriars Inn (Baker, *Endymion*, cxiv f.).

[2] *Stage*, 127 f.; Wallace, 73.

[3] *Stage*, 230.

[4] *Stage*, 131. Dr. Wallace throws some doubt on the truth of Clifton's statements concerning the kidnapping of these boys, except in the case of his son (Wallace, 80).

[5] *Stage*, 248; Wallace, 81, 82.

Evans had made over his lease of Blackfriars to his son-in-law, Hawkins,[1] and after the decision was given, he and Hawkins entered into an agreement with Edward Kirkham, William Rastell, and Thomas Kendall, whereby Evans and Hawkins on the one side, and Kirkham, Rastell, and Kendall on the other, divided the expenses and profits of the Blackfriars Theatre.[2] So matters stood till 1603.[3]

From Johnson's First Folio we get two partial lists of the Children of the Chapel, prefixed to *Cynthia's Revels*, acted in 1600, and *The Poetaster*, acted in 1601. The first of these mentions the following players :—

Nathaniel Field.
John Underwood.
Salathiel Pavy.
Robert Baxter.
Thomas Day.
John Frost.

The second :—

Nathaniel Field.
John Underwood.
Salathiel Pavy.
William Ostler
Thomas Day.
Thomas Martin.

We have no further information about the actors of this company before 1603.

[1] Wallace, 84, 85.

[2] *Stage*, 224 ; Wallace, 87. Kirkham's statement that he, Rastell, and Kendall spent £400 on the theatre as a result of this agreement is probably false (Wallace, 89).

[3] For an interesting discussion of Queen Elizabeth's relations with this company, cf. Wallace, chaps. viii. and ix.

## COURT PERFORMANCES

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| [1559. Dec. 31, . . . | *Misogonus.* | (The Children of the Chapel)].[1] |
| 1563-4. Xmas, . . . | [*Damon and Pythias*]. | ( ,, ).[2] |
| 1570. Jan. 6, . . . . | | ( ,, ).[3] |
| 1572. Jan. 6, . . . . | *Narcissus.* | ( ,, ).[4] |
| 1575. Feb. 13, . . . . | | ( ,, ).[5] |
| 1577. Jan. 6, . . . . | *History of Mutius Scevola.* | ( ,, ).[6] |
| 1578. Dec. 27, . . . . | | ( ,, ).[7] |
| 1579. March 2, . . . | *Loyalty and Beauty.* | ( ,, ).[8] |
| Dec. 27, . . . . | *Alcuis.* | ( ,, ).[9] |
| 1581. Feb. 5, . . . . | | ( ,, ).[10] |
| Dec. 31, . . . . | | ( ,, ).[11] |
| 1582. Feb. 27, . . . . | | ( ,, ).[11] |
| Dec. 26, . . . . | *Game of Cards.* | ( ,, ).[12] |
| 1601. Jan. 6, . . . . | A show with music and songs. | ( ,, ).[13] |
| Feb. 22, . . . . | A play. | ( ,, ).[13] |

### NOTES TO COURT PERFORMANCES

[1] The evidence for the conjecture that the Chapel Children performed *Misogonus* at Court on Dec. 31, 1559, is that, on that date a play was performed before the Queen at Court by a company not named. This proved so displeasing that it was not finished (Nichols, *Progresses*, i. 81). Now, in 1563-4, a tragedy, almost certainly *Damon and Pythias*, by Richard Edwards (Collier, i. 183 ; Ward, ii. 211), was acted by the Children of the Chapel at Court. From the prologue to this we learn that Edwards had written a previous play which on account of its 'ranging in young desires, etc.,' had given offence. This description fits *Misogonus*, an anonymous play of 1559-60, very well. The identification of Edwards as the author of this play is helped by internal evidence (Collier, ii. 368 f. ; *Stage*, 60). Also the date and nature of *Misogonus* fit very well the play which gave displeasure on Dec. 31, 1559. As Edwards was appointed Master of the Children of the Chapel in 1561 (*Dic. Nat. Biog.*), the evidence certainly indicates, though not conclusively, that the play performed on Dec. 31, 1559, was *Misogonus*, written by Edwards, and given by the Chapel Children (*Stage*, 60).

[2] Chalmers, *Apology*, 355-356 ; *Cal. State Papers*, 1565 ; Collier, i. 182 ; *Drama*, i. 162 ; *Stage*, 60. *Damon and Pythias* is the only 'tragedy' by Edwards which can possibly have been performed on this date.

[3] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxix. On Jan. 7, 1570, William Hunnis was paid £6, 13s. 4d. for a play performed by the Chapel Children before the Queen on Twelfth night at Windsor. Mr. Fleay unconvincingly conjectures that the play was *Cambyses* (*Stage*, 64).

[4] Cunningham, *Revels*, 13 ; Malone by Boswell, 423 ; Chalmers, *Apology*, 360. On Jan. 12, 1572 (the date 1573 given in the Council Registers is obviously incorrect, cf. *Stage*, 19), John (?) Hunnis was paid £6, 13s. 4d. for a play by the Chapel Children before the Queen on Twelfth night.

[5] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxi. On Feb. 16, 1575, William Hunnis was paid £13, 6s. 8d. for a play before the Queen, on Shrove Sunday, by the Chapel Children.

[6] Cunningham, *Revels*, 102 ; Chalmers, *Apology*, 361. On Jan. 20, 1577, the Chapel Children were paid £6, 13s. 4d. for this play. They performed it in conjunction with the Children of Windsor.

[7] Cunningham, *Revels*, 125 ; Chalmers, *Apology*, 361. For a play presented at Richmond on St. John's day at night, the Chapel Children were paid on Jan. 16, 1579. Mr. Fleay conjectures that the play was a revival of *Cambyses* (*Stage*, 64).

[8] Cunningham, *Revels*, 142. This play was performed at Whitehall on the evening of Shrove Monday.

[9] Cunningham, *Revels*, 154 ; Chalmers, *Apology*, 361. This performance was at Whitehall on the evening of St. John's day. A payment of £6, 13s. 4d., and a reward of £3, 6d. 8d., were given to the Chapel Children for it on Jan. 25, 1580.

[10] Cunningham, *Revels*, 168 ; Chalmers, *Apology*, 362. A payment of £6, 13s. 4d., and a reward of £3, 6s. 8d., were given to the Chapel Children on Feb. 13, 1581, for this play. Mr. Fleay conjectures, on slight evidence, that the play was Peele's *Arraignment of Paris* (*Drama*, ii. 152).

[11] Chalmers, *Apology*, 362. On April 1, 1582, the Chapel Children were paid 20 marks, and given a reward of 20 nobles, for two plays presented on December 31 and Shrove Tuesday. Mr. Fleay conjectures unconvincingly that the plays given were Lyly's *Alexander and Campaspe* and *Sapho and Phao* (*Drama*, ii. 39-40 ; Baker, *Endymion*, xcv *n.*).

[12] Cunningham, *Revels*, 176. This performance was before the Queen at Windsor on the evening of St. Stephen's day. No payment is recorded.

[13] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxiii. On May 4, 1601, Nathaniel Gyles was paid £10 for a play by the Chapel Children before the Queen at Whitehall on Shrove Sunday night, and for a show with music and songs on Twelfth night.

## PROVINCIAL VISITS

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1586-7, . . . . . | Norwich. | (The Children of the Queen's Chapel). |
| 1590-1. [Aug. 11]–Sept. 29, . | Leicester. | (The Children of the Chapel). |
| [1591. *c.* August, . . . | Croydon. | ].[1] |
| [1592. *c.* August, . . . | Croydon. | ].[1] |

[1] Nash's *Works*, ed. Grosart, VI. xxx-xxxiii; Hazlitt's *Dodsley*, viii. 17-18; *Stage*, 78. Thomas Nash's *Summer's Last Will and Testament* was acted *c.* August, 1592, at Croydon. It was performed by a company of children, and contains an allusion which seems to refer to another play given by the same company before the same audience in the previous year. Internal evidence does not indicate whether the play was by Paul's boys or the Children of the Chapel (cf. Baker, *Endymion*, cxxix). However, if, as in the present state of the evidence seems likely, the Martin Marprelate controversy was the cause of the suppression of Paul's boys, it is probable that this suppression occurred late in 1590, when drastic measures were taken against those involved in that controversy. If so, the company at Croydon was the Children of the Chapel. On the whole this appears to be the most likely conclusion (but cf. Baker, *Endymion*, clxiv f.).

## III

## THE CHILDREN OF WINDSOR CHAPEL

Soon after her accession, Queen Elizabeth gave orders for the improvement of the Chapel Choir at Windsor Castle. On March 8, 1560, she issued the following Privy Seal:—'Whereas our Castle of Windsor hath of old been well furnished with singing men and children, We, willing it should not be of less reputation in our days, but rather augmented and increased, declare, that no singing men or boys be taken out of the said chapel by virtue of any commission, not even for our household chapel: and we give power to the bearer of this to take any singing men and boys from any chapel, our own household, and St. Paul's only excepted. Given at Westminster, this 8th of March in the 2nd year of our reign.'[1] When these boys first took up playing is uncertain. Their first recorded performance was on Dec. 27, 1568, at Court. From this time till 1578, they appeared almost yearly at Court. After 1578 they are not heard of. Their master from 1568 to 1578, was Richard Ferrant.[2]

[1] Nicols, *Progresses*, i. 11.

[2] Cf. below, 339.

## COURT PERFORMANCES

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1568. Dec. 27, . . . | | (The Children of Windsor).[1] |
| 1569. Feb. 22, . . . | | ( ,, ).[2] |
| 1572. Jan. 1, . . . . | *Ajax and Ulysses.* | ( ,, ).[3] |
| 1572-3, . . . . . | | ( ,, ).[4] |
| 1574. Jan. 6, . . . . | *Quintus Fabius.* | ( ,, ).[5] |
| 1575. Jan. 6, . . . . | | ( ,, ).[6] |
| Dec. 27, . . . . | | ( ,, ).[7] |
| 1577. Jan. 6, . . . . | *Mutius Scevola.* | ( ,, ).[8] |
| 1578. Feb. 10, . . . . | | ( ,, ).[9] |

[1] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxix. On Jan. 2, 1569, Richard Ferrant, Master of the Children of Windsor Chapel was paid £6, 13s. 4d. for a play by those boys before the Queen 'upon St Johns daye at nighte laste paste.'

[2] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxix. On Feb. 25, 1569, Richard Ferrant was paid £6, 13s. 4d. for a play by the Children of Windsor before the Queen on 'Shrove Tewsdaye at nyght laste paste.'

[3] Cunningham, *Revels*, 13; Chalmers, *Apology*, 360. The payment of £6, 13s. 4d. on Jan. 12, 1572-3 (?) to Richard Ferrant for a play by the Children of Windsor 'on St. John's day last,' is most likely wrongly dated and refers to the performance of Jan. 1, 1572 (*Stage*, 18-19).

[4] Cunningham, *Revels*, 34, etc.

[5] Cunningham, *Revels*, 51; Chalmers, *Apology*, 361. On Jan. 10, 1574, Richard Ferrant was paid £6, 13s. 4d. for a play 'at Christmas last,' undoubtedly that of Jan. 6.

[6] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxi, 95, etc. On Jan. 23, 1575, Richard Ferrant was paid £13, 6s. 8d. for a play by the Children of Windsor before the Queen on 'Twelfe Nighte last paste.'

[7] Chalmers' *Apology*, 361. On Dec. 29, 1575, the Children of Windsor were paid £10 for a play at Court on 'St John's day last.'

[8] Cunningham, *Revels*, 102. This play was performed at Hampton Court on 'Twelf daie at Night,' by the Children of Windsor and the Chapel.

[9] Chalmers, *Apology*, 361. On March 12, 1578, Richard Ferrant was paid £6, 13s. 4d., and given a reward of £3, 6s. 8d. for a play by the Children of Windsor 'on Shrove Monday last.'

## IV

## THE CHILDREN OF WESTMINSTER SCHOOL

The earliest recorded appearance of the Children of Westminster School in a play, after the accession of Elizabeth, was *c.* Christmas, 1563-4, when they acted before the Queen at Court.[1] This performance seems to have pleased Her Majesty, for in 1564 she went to see them perform the *Heautontimoroumenos* of Terence, and the *Miles Gloriosus* of Plautus in their college of Westminster. At the performance of the latter play the school gave Elizabeth a copy of Plautus and distributed four other copies among her nobles.[2] These children often played at Court till 1574. Until 1572 their Master was John Taylor, and during 1572-3 and 1574 William Elderton.[3] After 1574 nothing is heard of any plays by these boys till 1606, when they performed three plays.[4] These were, no doubt, given in the school before parents and friends of the scholars.

[1] Cf. below, 341. In the Account-roll of Westminster for 1413-14 occurs the following item,—'Item data Pueris de Elemosinaria ludentibus coram Domino apud Westmonasterium iiis. iiiid.' (*Athenæum*, 1900, pt. 2, 655). This entry Mr. Scott takes to refer to an early play by the Westminster school boys, but Mr. E. K. Chambers thinks it refers more probably to their revel of the Boy-Bishop (*Athenæum*, 692).

[2] Cf. ii. 168 f.; cf. also for other interesting items concerning these performances.

[3] Cf. below, 341 *n.* 2, 4, 5.

[4] Cf. ii. 169-170.

## COURT PERFORMANCES

| | |
|---|---|
| 1563-4. *c.* Christmas, . . | (The Children of Westminster School).[1] |
| 1567. Shrovetide, . . . | ( „ ).[2] |
| 1572. Feb. 19, . . . | *Paris and Vienna.* ( „ ).[3] |
| 1572-3, . . . . . | (Elderton's players).[4] |
| 1574. Jan. 1, . . . . | *Truth, Faithfulness and Mercy.* (The Children of Westminster).[5] |

[1] Chalmers, *Apology*, 356; Collier, i. 183. The play was given at Windsor. Mr. Fleay conjectures that it was *Appius and Virginia*, by R. B. (*Stage*, 16).

[2] Chalmers, *Apology*, 360. On Feb. 13, 1567, John Taylor, master of the Children of Westminster School, was paid £6, 13s. 4d. for a play at Court on 'Shrovetide last.'

[3] Cunningham, *Revels*, 13; Chalmers, *Apology*, 360. On Feb. 29, 1573['72], the Children of Westminster were paid £6, 13s. 4d. for a play on 'Shrove-tuesday last.' There can be little doubt that this entry refers to the performance on Feb. 19, 1572 (*Stage*, 19).

[4] Cunningham, *Revels*, 42. Various items are mentioned for 'Elderton's playe.' The Children of Westminster were at this time under Elderton (cf. below).

[5] Cunningham, *Revels*, 51; Chalmers, *Apology*, 394. On Jan. 10, 1574, William Elderton was paid £6, 13s. 4d. for a play before the Queen at Whitehall by the Children of Westminster, on 'New yeares daye at nighte.'

## V

## THE CHILDREN OF MERCHANT TAYLORS' SCHOOL

THE boys of the Merchant Taylors' School, under Richard Mulcaster, their head-master,[1] performed plays at Court from 1572 to 1583. Nothing is heard of them in the city of London or the provinces.

[1] *Dict. Nat. Biog.*

### COURT PERFORMANCES

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1572-3, . . . . . | | (Richard Mulcaster's Children).[1] |
| 1574. Feb. 2, . . . . | *Timoclea.* | ( ,, ).[2] |
| Feb. 23, . . . . | *Perseus and Andromeda.* | ( ,, ).[3] |
| 1576. March 5, . . . | | ( ,, ).[4] |
| 1583. Feb. 12, . . . | *Ariodante and Genevora.* | ( ,, ).[5] |

[1] Cunningham, *Revels*, 34. Richard Mulcaster was head-master of Merchant Taylors' School from 1561 to 1586 (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*).

[2] Cunningham, *Revels*, 62. This performance was before the Queen at Hampton Court. The play was a tedious one.

[3] Cunningham, *Revels*, 68. '*Percius and Anthomiris*,' as the *Revels Book* has it, was played 'on Shrovetewsdaye at Nighte,' at Hampton Court.

[4] Chalmers, *Apology*, 395. On March 11, 1576, Richard Mulcaster was paid £10 for a play before the Queen on 'Shrove Sunday last.'

[5] Cunningham, *Revels*, 177. This performance was before the Queen on 'Shrovetuesdaie at night.'

## VI

## THE CHILDREN OF ETON

During the Christmas festivities of 1572-3, the Children of Eton School seem to have performed before the Queen at Court.[1] This is the only recorded appearance of these boys.

[1] Cunningham, *Revels*, 34. Mr. Fleay seems to think that these boys were the same as the Children of Windsor (*Stage*, 20). But the two following payments in the *Revels Book* for 1572-3, certainly appear to indicate that these were separate companies,—'Gloves for the Children of Eaten, ij$^{dozen}$ x$^{s}$'; 'Gloves for the Children of Wynsor, ij dozē, ꝛ for maskers xvj ꝑe xx$^{s}$. iiij$^{d}$.'

## VII

## 2, EARL OF OXFORD'S COMPANY

About 1562-3 the first company of players under the patronage of Edward de Vere, Earl of Oxford, was, in all probability, disbanded. Of this company there are no traces in London or at Court.[1] In spite of his love of music and the drama, the Earl of Oxford does not seem to have had another company of players under his patronage till 1580, when references to his players again appear in the provincial records. On June 21, 1580, Dr. John Hatcher, Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge University, wrote to Lord Burghley, giving reasons why the Heads of the University objected to the Earl of Oxford's players, 'shewing their cunninge in certayne playes already practysed by them before the Q. Ma^tie.'[2] Whether or not Hatcher was correct in saying that Oxford's players had acted before the Queen prior to June, 1580, is uncertain. At any rate there are no records of such performances. In September, 1581, this company played at Bristol, and the City-Chamberlain noted some interesting details about its construction. He writes:—'Itm pd to my Lord of Oxfords players at the end of their play in the Yeld hall before Mr. Mayer & Mr. Mayor Sleck(?) and the Aldermen

[1] Cf. Earl of Oxford's players, ii. 62-63.

[2] Cf. ii. 221.

being i man and ix boyes at iis a piece—the sum of xx$^{s}$.'[1] The Oxford company formed about 1580 was then, undoubtedly, a company of boys.[2] Until 1589-90 this company frequently played in the provinces. On Dec. 27, 1584, they acted at Court. The company is then described as 'the Earl of Oxenford his boyes,' and the play performed was *The History of Agamemnon and Ulysses*, which may have been written by the Earl of Oxford himself, for he was reckoned by Puttenham and Meres among 'the best for comedy' of his time.[3]

In all probability Anthony Munday was connected as actor and playwright with this Earl of Oxford's company from the time of its formation about 1580. Soon after his return to England from Rome, he published *The Mirrour of Mutabilitie*, which was licensed on Oct. 10, 1579. This he dedicated to the Earl of Oxford. About the same time he seems to have returned to the stage, for the author of the *True Report* speaks of him as being hissed off the boards.[4] Most likely he was soon acting again, for in 1580 he published his *View of Sundry Examples*, and subscribes his address to his readers, 'Servant to the right honourable the Earl of Oxenford.' In the body of this work he is frequently referred to as the 'servant to the Earl of Oxford.' The author of the *True Report* (pub. 1582) also refers to Munday

[1] Cf. ii. 215.

[2] In the *Weakest goes to the Wall*, acted by Oxford's company, probably *c.* 1584, that company is referred to as 'pigmies' (II. i.). This play may have been written for them by Munday, as Mr. Fleay suggests (*Drama*, ii. 318).

[3] Puttenham, *Arte of English Poesie*, Bk. I. xiv, xxxi; Meres, *Wit's Treasury*.

[4] *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, xxxix. 290 f.; Fleay, *Drama*, ii. 108-111.

as 'boy'; as Munday was at the time about twenty-eight years of age, this can only refer to his connection with the Earl of Oxford's company of boys. Possibly Munday was the one man who, with eleven boys, constituted the Earl of Oxford's company which visited Bristol in 1581. About 1584 Munday was appointed 'one of the messengers of her Majesty's chamber.'[1] Probably he did not act after receiving this appointment.'[2]

On January 25, 1587, Walsingham's spy mentioned the Earl of Oxford's company as one of those which regularly set up players' bills in the city every day in the week.[3] From this time till 1602 nothing is heard of the Earl of Oxford's players in London, and they appeared only twice in the provinces, once in June 1587, at York, and once in 1589-90, at Maidstone. In 1602 they again appeared in London and were permitted to play at the Boar's Head,[4] in

[1] *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, xxxix. 292.

[2] Whether or not Munday wrote for Oxford's company after 1584 is not known. In December, 1597, he and Drayton wrote *Mother Redcap* for the Admiral's men (*Diary*, ed. Greg, 82-83).

[3] Collier, i. 257.

[4] *Index to Remembrancia*, 1878, 355; i. 95. Whether or not the Boar's Head, Eastcheap, was the usual place for Oxford's players to occupy when in London is unknown. Mr. Fleay conjectures that they acted at the Curtain 1586-88 (*Stage*, 85, 86). He thus states his evidence for this opinion: 'In January, 1587, the four men companies acting in London were the Queen's, Oxford's, Leicester's, and the Admiral's. Of these we know that the Queen's acted at the Theatre, and the Admiral's within the City. Leicester's, which afterwards became Lord Strange's, surely acted at the Cross Keys. We have left one theatre, the Curtain, and one company to fill it—Oxford's' (*Stage*, 86). This reasoning is valueless, because it is not known how many companies were acting in London in January, 1587. The letter of Walsingham's spy, on which Mr. Fleay bases the above theory, states that players' bills were set up in the City, 'some in the name of her Majestie's menne, some the Earl of Leic$^{r}$, some the E. of Oxford, the Lo. Admyralles, and dyvers others' (Collier, i. 257). 'Dyvers others' Mr.

Eastcheap. After this nothing further is heard of them.[1]

Fleay interprets as meaning Paul's boys (*Stage*, 91), because that is the only other company mentioned in the London records of 1587. Apart from the inherent improbability of 'Dyvers others' referring to only one company, the fact that there were several other companies (cf. Worcester's, Sussex's, Arundel's, Essex's) which might have been acting in London at this time, and only one playing-place, the Theatre, the occupancy of which can be fixed with any certainty (cf. above, 11) makes the available evidence altogether too fragmentary upon which to found any such theory as Mr. Fleay's.

[1] Mr. Fleay's statements about the Earl of Oxford's company are contradictory and confusing. They are: (1) In his Index List of the careers of the companies he dates Oxford's men 1580-1586 (*Stage*, 369). (2) In his account of the companies from 1559-1586, he says: 'At the death of Sussex in 1583 his players probably entered the service of Edward de Vere, Earl of Oxford' (*Stage*, 35). Yet according to (1) Oxford's company was formed in 1580. (3) In his 'General Stage History' (1586-1593) under the date Jan. 25, 1587, he quotes from Walsingham's spy, who states that at that time the Queen's, Leicester's, Oxford's, and Admiral's companies were acting in London (*Stage*, 91). Yet according to (1) Oxford's company ceased acting in 1586. (4) In his account of the theatres (1586-1593) he conjectures 'with almost certainty' that Oxford's company played at the Curtain 1586-1588 (*Stage*, 88). This again conflicts with statement (1) that Oxford's players ceased acting in 1586. (5) In his table headed, 'List of Authors chronologically arranged under their Companies,' he dates Oxford's players 1584-1588 (*Drama*, ii. 403). This contradicts (1) and (2) by stating that Oxford's company began acting under that name in 1584, instead of 1580 or 1583. (6) In his account of Anthony Munday's career he says: 'The company for which he played was the Earl of Oxford's, *c.* 1579-1584' (*Drama*, ii. 109). This conflicts with (1), (2), and (5) by giving *c.* 1579 as the earliest date for Oxford's company.

Mr. Fleay's statements concerning the construction of this company are also confusing. They are: (1) In his list of Court performances (1558-1586) he states without comment that 'the Earl of Oxenford his boys' performed at Court on St. John's Day, 1584 (*Stage*, 30). (2) Referring to Oxford's players in his comments on *The Weakest goeth to the Wall* he says: 'This company is sometimes called "Oxford's boys," and as such in ii. 1, they are alluded to as "pigmies"' (*Drama*, ii. 318). (3) In his account of the company he says: 'In January, 1587, the four men companies acting in London were the Queen's, Oxford's, Leicester's, and the Admiral's' (*Stage*, 86). The only way to reconcile these statements is to suppose that Oxford's players grew from boys to men from 1584 to 1587; but Mr. Fleay nowhere offers this suggestion.

## COURT PERFORMANCE

(Patron, Edward de Vere, Earl of Oxford, 1562, Aug. 3–1604. June 24.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1584. Dec. 27, . . . | *The History of Agamemnon and Ulysses.* | ('Earle of Oxenford his boyes').[1] |

[1] Cunningham, *Revels*, 188. This play was presented before the Queen on 'St Johns daie at night at Grenewiche.'

## PROVINCIAL VISITS

(Patron, Edward de Vere, Earl of Oxford, 1562, Aug. 3–1604, June 24.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1580. *c.* June 21, . . . | Oxford. | (The Earl of Oxford's players). |
| 1580-1, . . . . . | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 22, '80–Nov. 15, '81, . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| [*c.* July, '81], . . . | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| Sept. '81, . . . . | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |
| 1581-2. Oct. 27, '81, . . | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 15, '81–Nov. 8. '82, . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| 1582-3. Feb., '83, . . . | Bristol. | ( ,, ). |
| May 23, '83, . . . | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| June 2, '83, . . . | Abingdon. | ( ,, ). |
| | Southampton. | ( ,, ). |
| [*c.* June, '83], . . . | Exeter. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 8, '82–Nov. 26, '83, . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| 1583-4. Jan. 20, '84, . . | Ipswich. | ( ,, ). |
| | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| March, '84, . . . | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| [Jan. 11–May 2, '84], . . | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |
| May 13, '84, . . . | Exeter. | ( ,, ). |
| [1584], . . . . | Southampton. | ( ,, ). |
| Nov. 26, '83–Nov. 24, '84, . | Coventry. | ( ,, ). |
| [March 6–Sept. 28, '84], . | Leicester. | ( ,, ). |
| 1584-5. April 3–April 17, '85, . | Dover. | ( ,, ). |
| June 16, '84–June 16, '85, . | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| Later in 1584-5, . . . | Bath. | ( ,, ). |
| | Gloucester. | ( ,, ). |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Nov. 24, '84–Nov. 30, '85, . | Coventry. | (The Earl of Oxford's players). |
| Last of June, '85, . . | York. | ( ,, ). |
| | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| 1585-6, . . . . . | Norwich. | ( ,, ). |
| 1587. June, . . . . | York. | ( ,, ). |
| 1589-90. Jan. 20, '89–[Jan., '90], | Maidstone. | ( ,, ). |

# PART V

# CHILDREN'S COMPANIES

## 1603-1642

# I

# CHILDREN OF PAUL'S—1, KING'S REVELS COMPANY

After 1603, Paul's boys are only heard of in 1606, when they acted three times at Court. They were then under the management of Edward Kirkham, who had left the 1, Queen's Revels Children, with whom he had been connected in 1604.[1] The probabilities are that they acted at Whitefriars till 1607, and were then reorganised as the 1, Children of the King's Revels, for in 1607 they disappeared and the 1, King's Revels began acting. If this is so, the King's desire to have all the regular London companies under royal patronage was at last satisfied. The 1, King's Revels acted at Whitefriars till 1609.[2] As they are not heard of after 1609, and in Jan., 1610, their theatre was occupied by the Queen's Revels company, there can be little doubt that they dispersed in 1609. There are no references to them in the provinces.

[1] Cf. below, 354. [2] *Drama*, i. 182-83.

## COURT PERFORMANCES

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1606. Jan. 1, . . . . | *A Trick to catch the old one.* | (The Children of Paul's).[1] |
| | [*The Phœnix*], | ( ,, ).[1] |
| July 30, . . . . | *Abuses.* | ( ,, ).[2] |

[1] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxviii; *Drama*, ii. 91-92. On March 31, 1606, Edward Kirkham was paid £26, 13s. 4d. for two plays performed at Court before Prince Henry and Prince Charles.

[2] Nichols, *Progresses*, iv. 1074.

## II

## 1, 2, 3, 4, CHILDREN OF THE QUEEN'S REVELS COMPANIES

### I

After the death of Elizabeth on March 24, 1603, the Children of the Chapel continued to act at Blackfriars till the theatres were closed by the severity of the plague about May 26. They did not reopen till April, 1604.[1] During the Christmas holidays, however, plays were given at Court; one of these, on Feb. 20, 1604, being by the Children of the Chapel under their new name, the Queen's Revels Children. This title they assumed on Jan 30, 1604, when they were taken under the Queen's patronage and granted a new licence. They were then under the management of Edward Kirkham, Alexander Hawkins, Thomas Kendall, and Robert Payne. Their plays were to receive 'the approbation and allowance' of Samuel Daniel, and they were to continue playing 'within the Blackfryers.'[2]

Sometime during 1603-4, after the 1603 plague, Evans, discouraged by his losses while the theatres were closed, began treating with Burbadge about transferring the lease of Blackfriars to him. These negotiations, however, did not come to anything,

[1] Cf. above, 148-149.

[2] Collier, i. 340; *Cal. State Papers.*

possibly because Evans's hopes were raised by the new licence and royal patronage granted to his company in Jan., 1604.[1]

Daniel seems to have shown extremely bad judgment in his choice of plays for the Queen's Revels, for twice during 1604-5 did plays performed by this company give offence. One of these was his own *Philotas*, printed in 1605, which was supposed to treat of the execution of the Earl of Essex,[2] the other was *Eastward Ho!* by Jonson, Chapman, and Marston, which roused the Court by its satire on the Scots.[3] As a result of this feeling the authors, and some of the actors, were imprisoned and the company temporarily prohibited from acting.[4] This prohibition must have been issued after Jan. 3, 1605, when these boys made their last appearance at Court.[5]

No doubt it was at this time that Edward Kirkham left the Queen's Revels Children to take the management of Paul's boys, who took the place of Queen's Revels company in the Court performances of 1606.[6]

Probably the Children of the Chapel were soon allowed to resume playing at Blackfriars, for *c.* 1607-8 Chapman's *Conspiracy and Tragedy of Charles, Duke of Byron*, was acted at that theatre.[7]

[1] *Stage*, 235. Evans may also have been encouraged by the fact that Gyles, who in 1600 had been in disgrace for kidnapping children, was on Sept. 17, 1604, authorised to take up children for the Chapel. Gyles's Patent, of course, literally only gave him authority over the choristers of the Chapel, not over the playing boys (Collier, i. 438; *Stage*, 207).

[2] Collier, iii. 68-72; *Drama*, i. 91. Though it is nowhere definitely stated that *Philotas* was acted by the Queen's Revels children, there can be little doubt that the company with which Daniel was so closely connected would act his plays.

[3] Collier, i. 343-344; *Drama*, i. 346-347.

[4] *Stage*, 245.

[5] Cf. below, 363.

[6] Cf. above, 353.

[7] Halliwell-Phillipps, *Dictionary of Old English Plays*, 57.

As the statements of Evans and Kirkham seem to imply that this company continued to act at Blackfriars,[1] no doubt *Byron* was performed by them. These plays got both players and author into trouble, as the following despatch from Beaumont, the French Ambassador in London shows :—'*April* 5, 1608.[2]—I caused certain Players to be forbid from acting the *History of the Duke of Biron* ; when, however, they saw that the whole Court had left the town they persisted in acting it ; nay, they brought upon the stage the Queen of France and Mademoiselle de Verneuil. The former having first accosted the latter with very hard words, gave her a box on the ear. At my suit three of them were arrested, but the principal person, the author, escaped.

'One or two days before they had brought forward their own King and his favorites in a very strange fashion. They made him curse and swear because he had been robbed of a bird, and beat a gentleman because he had called off the hounds from the scent.

'He has made an order that no play shall be henceforth acted in London ; for the repeal of which order they have already offered 100,000 livres. Perhaps the permission will be again granted, but upon the condition that they represent no recent history, nor speak of the present time.' [3]

After their temporary suppression in 1605 this company does not seem to have enjoyed the Queen's

[1] *Stage*, 246, 249.

[2] 1606, in Collier, following the inaccurate translation of Ellesmere (cf. *Drama*, i. 62 ; *Stage*, 185).

[3] Quoted, Collier, i. 352, from Earl of Ellesmere's translation of Von Raumer's *History of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, ii. 219.

patronage, though still popularly known as the Children of the Queen's Revels.[1] They were also called the Children of the Revels and the Children of the Chapel.[2]

This new prohibition of the Chapel Children was probably too much for Evans, who surrendered the lease of Blackfriars Theatre to Richard Burbadge in August, 1608.[3] At that time the theatres were closed on account of the plague. When they reopened in December, 1609, Burbadge continued the Children of the Queen's Revels, who had meanwhile regained the Queen's patronage, in Blackfriars. This reoccupation of Blackfriars could have lasted only a few weeks, for by Jan. 4, 1610, the Queen's Revels had been reorganised and moved into Whitefriars, the King's men taking Underwood, Field, and Ostler into their company, and themselves occupying Blackfriars.[4]

II

The second Children of the Queen's Revels company received their Patent on Jan. 4, 1610. This authorised them to act ' within the Whitefryers, in the subburbes of our Cittie of London, or in any other convenient place,' and appointed ' Phillip Rossetter, and certaine others,' managers of the company.[5] Their principal members are known from the list of actors prefixed to Jonson's *Epicene*,

[1] *Stage*, 246, 249.
[2] Cf. Provincial and Court Lists, below, 363-366.
[3] *Stage*, 235.
[4] Cf. above, 154-155.
[5] Collier, i. 381, 359 ; *Stage*, 185.

which was probably acted at Whitefriars before March 25, 1610.[1] They were :—

Nathaniel Field.[2]
William Barkstead (Baxter).
Giles Carey.
William Penn.
Hugh Attawel.
Richard Allen.
John Smith
John Blaney.

Another list of the company is given in the second folio edition of Beaumont and Fletcher's *Coxcomb*. This must date before Aug. 29, 1611, when Barkstead and Carey had joined the Princess Elizabeth's players,[3] and probably after March 30, 1610, when Taylor belonged to the Duke of York's men.[4] It mentions the following actors :—

[1] *Drama*, i. 374 ; Thorndike, *Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakspere*, 16-17. This play, Mr. Thorndike insists, was performed in 1609, because, he says, Jonson dated his plays according to the new system, *i.e.* Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, and not according to the old way, March 25 to March 24. The proof he offers for the latter statement is by no means conclusive, being that he finds in the case of a few Court performances of Jonson's Masques that they are dated according to the new system (one of these, *The Golden Age Restored*, he acknowledges to be dated by the old style in the folio, but explains that that part of the folio was not supervised by Jonson). However, even if *Epicene* is to be dated 1609, this simply means, either that it was first acted in the provinces ; or that, if performed in London, it was acted during December, the only time that year when the theatres were open—Mr. Thorndike's theory that the theatres may have been open during the rest of 1609 is untenable (cf. ii. 175 f.)—and that the mention of Whitefriars in the Prologue was only of general significance and not a particular reference to the occupancy of Whitefriars theatre by the Queen's Revels company. This would make the *Epicene* list one of the 1, Queen's Revels just before their new Patent of Jan. 4, 1610, was granted. But the reading of the facts given in the text seems much more plausible. [2] Cf. above, 154. [3] Cf. above, 243-244.

[4] Cf. above, 231. Mr. Thorndike argues that it is much more probable that Taylor was a Queen's Revels man before March 30, 1610, and

Nathaniel Field.
Joseph Taylor.
Giles Carey.
Emanuel Read.
Richard Allen.
Hugh Attawel.
Robert Benfield.
William Barkstead (Baxter).[1]

On August 10, 1611, a company under Ralph Reeve arrived in Norwich and showed the Mayor's Court Rossiter's Patent as their authority for playing. At first Reeve affirmed that he was Rossiter, but on being discovered and unable to show any 'Letters of Deputacon' from Rossiter, he was commanded to leave the town with his company on pain of imprisonment. On August 11, however, the authorities so far relented as to give him a reward of 40s.[2] There can be no doubt that this company was a part of the 2, Queen's Revels, though the Chamberlain who gave them their reward called them 'the Children of the kinges Revelles,' probably because their licence was signed by the King.[3]

joined the Duke of York's company on that date (*Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakspere*, 67). This theory is based on the supposition that the Duke of York's company was just established on March 30, 1610. But as this company almost certainly existed for several years prior to 1610, and their licence of March 30, 1610, was merely a new licence granted to an old company, there can be little doubt that Taylor, who is mentioned for the first time in March 30, 1610, had been a Duke of York's man before that date.

[1] Mr. Fleay in his *Stage* (p. 187) considers this to be a list of the 2, Lady Elizabeth's players. This theory he later abandons, *Drama*, i. 185.

[2] Cf. ii. 339, 370.

[3] If these men had belonged to a regularly constituted travelling Queen's Revels company they would surely have had a duplicate licence and letter of deputation.

On May 20, 1612, these players reappeared in Norwich, this time under Nicholas Long. They showed the Queen's Revels licence and a proper 'deputacion' from Rossiter, but the Mayor's Court decided that their licence only gave Rossiter the right 'to teach and instruct' children, and therefore refused to allow the company to play, though it granted them a reward of 20s., which the Chamberlain duly recorded as paid to 'the Master of the kyngs Revells.' [1]

During October, 1612, and January and February, 1613, the Queen's Revels Children appeared at Court for the last time.

III

In March, 1613, the 2, Queen's Revels, under Rossiter, and the 1, Princess Elizabeth's men, under Henslowe joined forces. The new company played under the name of the Princess Elizabeth's players. Meanwhile those members of the two companies who were not included in the 2, Princess Elizabeth's company seem to have travelled under the management of Nicholas Long. They also called themselves the Princess Elizabeth's players.[2]

IV

When, in March or April, 1614, Henslowe made up a new Princess Elizabeth's company, a third Queen's Revels was also formed. Probably it contained many of Nicholas Long's travelling Lady Elizabeth's company.[3] They played at Coventry

[1] Cf. ii. 339, 370.
[2] Cf. above, 245-246.
[3] Cf. ii. 3-4.

on Oct. 7, 1615, and during 1616 and 1617 at Nottingham and Leicester. It was, no doubt, to this company that reference was made in the Privy Seal of May 31, 1615, which allowed Philip Rossiter, Philip Kingman, Robert Jones, and Ralph Reeve to build a new theatre in the Blackfriars for the use of the children of the Queen's Revels, the Prince's and the Lady Elizabeth's players.[1] This theatre was demolished in 1616 or 1617.[2]

V

On Oct. 31, 1617, a new Children of the Queen's Revels company was organised under the leadership of Robert Lee, Philip Rossiter, William Perry, and Nicholas Long. Their licence of that date permitted them 'to play comedyes by the space of ffourten dayes in any Citty.'[3] Robert Lee had joined this company from Queen Anne's players,[4] and William Perry had been the manager of the 2, King's Revels, which was suppressed in 1616.[5] On Aug. 29, 1618, they visited Norwich, and were allowed to act three days in the city.[6] After Queen Anne's death on March 2, 1619, this company was known as the

[1] Collier, i. 381-382. Mr. Fleay throws some doubt on the genuineness of this document (*Stage*, 263), but as the provincial records show that a Queen's Revels company existed from 1615 to 1617, and that Ralph Reeve was connected with the Queen's Revels Children before 1615, we may be pretty certain of the authenticity of Collier's document. Mr. Fleay also considers that the Queen's Revels were finally dissolved in 1613 (*Stage*, 251, 369). The cause of this he conjectures to be the acting of Taylor's *Hog hath lost his Pearl* at Whitefriars by some London apprentices during 1613. The existence of a Queen's Revels company after 1613 sufficiently overthrows this conjecture.

[2] Cf. above, 249-250.

[3] Cf. ii. 345.

[4] Cf. above, 189, 192.

[5] Cf. ii. 10.

[6] *Ibid.*, 345.

Children of the Revels to the late Queen Anne.[1] Before that date Robert Lee had returned to the Queen's players,[2] and in February, 1620, Nicholas Long left them to take the management of a newly formed company.[3]

On April 9, 1623, a confirmation of their licence of Oct. 31, 1617, good for one year, was granted to these players by Sir Francis Markham, Deputy-master of the Revels. This confirmation names the following members of the company :—

William Perry.
George Bosegrave.
Richard Backster.
Thomas Band.
James Jones.
Walter Barrett.
James Kneller.
Edward Tobye.

It also states that the company was not to exceed twenty in number. At the time they were under the management of William Perry.[4]

On May 24, 1623, they appeared at Norwich with this confirmation, but were 'denyed to play as well for the cause of the poore whose worke cannot be wanted as for some Contagion feared to be begun as also for feare of tumult of the people.' They also presented it at Exeter where the town clerk, Samuel Izaacke, entered in his book a duly attested copy of it. Until 1627 there are notices of this company in the provinces. Between that year and Sept. 18, 1629, however, they broke up, for on

[1] Cf. below, 365.
[2] Cf. above, 196.
[3] Cf. ii. 101.
[4] *Ibid.*, 347, 272-273.

that day a commission was granted to William Perry to make up a company to be called 'His Majesty's servants for the city of York.'[1] Whether or not they acted in London is unknown as there are no records of them either in the City or at Court, though the importance of their managers, especially Rossiter, would lead us to suppose that they sometimes played in London. On this supposition I have placed these players among the London companies.

[1] *Cal. State Papers*, vol. 1629-1631.

## COURT PERFORMANCES

### I

(1, Queen's Revels Co., 1604, Jan. 30–1610, Jan. 4.)

| | |
|---|---|
| 1604. Feb. 20, . . . | (The Children of the Queen's Revels).[1] |
| 1605. Jan. 1, . . . . | [*All Fools*]. ( ,, ).[2] |
| Jan. 3, . . . . | ( ,, ).[2] |

### II

(2, Queen's Revels Co., 1610, Jan. 4–1613, March.)

| | |
|---|---|
| [1612. Jan. 5, . . . | *Cupid's Revenge.* (The Children of White-friars)].[3] |
| 1612. [Between Oct. 16 and 24], | *The Coxcomb.* (Children of the Queen's Revels, or Children of the Chapel).[4] |
| 1613. Jan. 1, . . . . | *Cupid's Revenge.* (Philip Rossiter's Company).[5] |
| Jan. 9, . . . . | *Cupid's Revenge.* (Philip Rossiter's Company or Children of the Chapel).[6] |
| Feb. 20, . . . . | *The Widow's Tears.* (Philip Rossiter's Company, or Children of the Chapel).[6] |
| 1613, . . . . . | *The Coxcomb.* (Children of the Queen's Revels).[7] |

## NOTES TO COURT PERFORMANCES

[1] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxvii. On April 30, 1604, Edward Kirkham was paid £10 for a play by the Children of the Queen's Revels before the King at Whitehall on 'Shrovetuesdaye last at night.'

[2] Cunningham, *Revels*, xxxvi, 204. On Feb. 24, 1604-5, Samuel Daniel and Henry Evans were paid £13, 6s. 8d., and given a reward of £6, 13s. 4d., for two plays on Jan. 1 and 3, before the King. The play of Jan. 1 is given as Chapman's *All Fools* in Cunningham's forged *Revels Book* for 1604-5. As this was probably based on some authentic document the entry may be genuine (*Stage*, 177).

[3] Cunningham, *Revels*, 211. This performance was on 'The Sunday following' New Year.

[4] Vertue MS., quoted *Shak. Soc. Papers*, ii. 125; Cunningham, *Revels*, xlii. On Nov. 24, 1612, Rossiter was paid £6, 13s. 4d. for *The Coxcomb*, acted by the Queen's Revels before Prince Henry, the Lady Elizabeth, and the Prince Palatine. As Mr. Fleay points out, the performance must have been between Oct. 16 the date of the Prince Palatine's arrival, and Oct. 24, when Prince Henry fell ill (*Stage*, 175).

[5] Vertue MS., quoted *Shak. Soc. Papers*, ii. 126. For this play Rossiter was paid 20 nobles and given a reward of five marks, in all £10.

[6] Vertue MS., quoted *Shak. Soc. Papers*, ii. 126; Cunningham, *Revels*, xlii. For these two plays Rossiter was paid £13, 6s. 8d., probably on May 31. In the Council Registers the payment of that date is to the Children of the Chapel.

[7] Oldys, MS. notes on Langbaine, quoted Dyce, *Beaumont and Fletcher*, iii. 117. For this performance the company received £10.

## PROVINCIAL VISITS

### I

(1, Queen's Revels Co., 1604, Jan. 30–1610, Jan. 4.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| [1608. Aug. 21, . . . | Leicester. | (Children of Revels)]. [1] |

### II

(2, Queen's Revels Co., 1610, Jan. 4–1613, March.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1609-10. [*c.* March, 1610], . | Maidstone. | (Children of the Chapel). |
| 1610-11. Aug. 10, '11, . . | Norwich. | (Rossiter's Children). |
| 1612-3. May 20, '12, . . | Norwich. | ( „ ). |
| [1612-3, . . . . . | Coventry. | (Children of Revels)][1]. |

III

(3, Queen's Revels Co., 1614, *c.* March–1617, *c.* Oct. 31.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1615. Oct. 7, . . . . | Coventry. | (Queen's Revels Company). |
| 1615-6. Feb. 1616, . . . | Nottingham. | ( ,, ). |
| [Before Feb. 22, '16], . . | Leicester. | (Children of Revels)].[2] |
| [June 21, '16, . . . | Coventry. | ( ,, )].[3] |
| June 22, '16, . . . | Leicester. | ( ,, )]. |
| 1616-7, . . . . . | Nottingham. | (Queen's Revels Company). |

IV

(4, Queen's Revels Co., 1617, Oct. 31–*c.* 1629.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1618. Aug. 29, . . . | Norwich. | (Company of Rossiter, Perry, Lee, and Long). |
| [1618, . . . . . | Leicester. | (Children of Revels)].[4] |
| 1619, . . . . . | Leicester. | (Perry and Company). |
| [1620, . . . . . | Leicester. | (Children of Revels)]. |
| 1622. April 12, . . . | Leicester. | (Children of Queen's Revels). |
| June 28, . . . . | Norwich. | (Company of late Queen Anne).[5] |
| [1623. [After Jan. 25], . . | Leicester. | (Company of Master of Revels)]. |
| May 24, '23, . . . | Norwich. | (Perry and the Company of Queen Anne). |
| [1623-4], . . . . | Exeter. | (Children of Revels to late Queen Anne). |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| [1624. Between March 18–July 9, | Leicester. | (Children of Revels)]. |
| [1627. [After July 8], . . | Leicester. | ( „ )]. |

NOTES TO PROVINCIAL VISITS

[1] As there are no references to a King's Revels company in the Provinces till 1615, this entry no doubt refers to the Children of the Queen's Revels.

[2] The wording of the entries for 1615-6 in the Leicester records seem to indicate that this was a Queen's company (cf. ii. 312).

[3] Either this or the following entry may refer to the 2, King's Revels company (cf. ii. 10). Still, as after 1615 there are no sure references to a King's Revels company in the provinces for a couple of years, and it was quite possible for a company to get from Coventry to Leicester in a day, the probabilities are that both entries refer to the Queen's Revels company.

[4] Cf. ii. 10-11.

[5] With Revels licence of Oct. 31, 1617.

## III

## BEESTON'S BOYS, OR THE KING AND QUEEN'S YOUNG COMPANY

A NEW children's company under the management of Christopher Beeston was formed shortly before Feb. 7, 1637, the date of their first recorded appearance.[1] This company was known as 'Beeston's Boys,' or 'The King and Queen's company.'[2] When, on Feb. 23, the plague decreased and the King allowed the theatres to reopen, these players probably occupied the Cockpit, for while the theatres were again closed from March 1 to Oct. 2, 1637, they gave a performance at that theatre. For this infringement of the regulations Christopher Beeston, William Beeston, Theophilus Bird [or Bourne], Ezekiel Fenn, and Michael Moone [or Mohun] were summoned before the Privy Council on May 12, and all plays stopped at the Cockpit till' further order.'[3] In addition to the above players it is pretty certain that Burt, who had been Shank's boy in the King's company, and was a famous player of women's parts, was also a member of this company.[4]

[1] Malone by Boswell, iii. 239. [2] *Ibid.*, 242.

[3] *Cal. State Papers*, 1637. Possibly the following undated petition of Christopher Beeston to the Privy Council, which is given conjecturally under 1636 in the *Cal. State Papers*, refers to this unlawful performance—'Petitioner being commanded to erect and prepare a company of young actors for their Majestie's service, and being desirous to know how they profited by his instructions, invited some noblemen and gentlemen to see them act at his house, the Cockpit. For which, since he perceives it is imputed as a fault, he is very sorry, and craves pardon.'

[4] Cf. King's men list in *Historia Histrionica*. Burt played Clariane in *Love's Cruelty*, and Mohun acted Bellamante in the same play.

During 1637 this company obtained an order from the Lord Chamberlain prohibiting the unauthorised printing of their plays.[1]

When the theatres reopened on Oct. 2, 1637, Beeston's boys began playing at the Cockpit. This is learned from the following undated entry in Herbert's office-book: 'Mr. Beeston was commanded to make a company of boyes, and began to play at the Cockpitt with them the same day.'[2] As this entry immediately follows that noting that the companies were allowed to play on Oct. 2, 1637, it undoubtedly belongs to that date, and refers to the removal of the order of May 11 for closing the Cockpit, and the reassembling of the boys, who had, no doubt, been considerably scattered during their long idleness on account of the plague.[3] These boys continued to occupy the Cockpit till the closing of the theatres in 1642.[4]

On August 10, 1639, an order was issued confirming this company in the possession of the following plays, and forbidding all other companies to act them: '*Witt without Money; The Night Walkers; The Knight of the burning Pestill; Father's owne Sonne; Cupid's Revenge; The Bondman; The Renegado; A New way to pay Debts; The Great Duke of Florence; the Maid of Honor; The Traytor; The Example; The Young Admirall; The Oportunity; A Witty fayre one; Love's Cruelty; The Wedding; The Maid's Revenge; The Lady of Pleasure; The Schoole of Complement; The Grateful Servant; The Coronation; Hide Parke; Philip*

[1] Cf. above, 169.
[2] Malone by Boswell, iii. 240.
[3] Malone by Boswell, iii. 239.
[4] Cf. below *passim*.

*Chabot Admiral of France ; A Mad Couple well mett ; All 's lost by Lust ; The Changeling ; A fayre Quarrell ; The Spanish Gypsie ; The World ; The Sunne's Darling ; Love's Sacrifice ; 'Tis Pitty Shee 's a Whore ; George-a-greene ; Love's Mistress ; The Cunning Lovers ; The Rape of Lucrese ; A Trick to cheat the Devill ; A Foole and her Maydenhead soon parted ; King John and Matilda ; A Citty Night Cap ; The Bloody Banquett ; Cupid's Vagaries ; The Conceited Duke ;* and *Appius and Virginia.*' [1] The cause of this order was, no doubt, that the Queen's players were occasionally acting some of these plays, which they had given up to Beeston's boys when that company was formed.[2]

In March, 1640, Charles I. planned a journey to Scotland. Soon after, Beeston's boys, then under the management of William Beeston, performed a play which contained passages dealing with this journey. To these passages the King objected, and Herbert was ordered to punish the offenders. Moreover, this play had not been licensed by Herbert. So on May 3, 1640, an order was issued commanding 'W^m^ Bieston, George Estoteville, and the rest of the Company of Players at the Cockpit in Drury Lane' to stop playing till further orders from the Master of the Revels. In addition to this William Beeston was committed to the Marshalsea prison. However, on May 7, the company having offered a 'petition of submission,' Herbert allowed hem to play.[3]

It was not lor ; before the company again abused

[1] Collier, ii. 24, 25 ; *Stage*, 356, 357.
[2] Cf. above, 268.
[3] Malone by Boswell, iii. 241 ; Collier, ii. 31, 32 *n.*

their privileges, and consequently on June 27, 1640, William Beeston was removed from their management, and William Davenant appointed in his place. Davenant was to hold this position so long as the lease of the Cockpit was held by 'Mrs. Elizabeth Beeston, alias Hutcheson.' [1]

This company, of course, broke up when the playhouses were closed in 1642. There are no records of them in the provinces.

[1] Malone by Boswell, iii. 242; Collier, ii. 32, 33 *n*. Mr. Fleay supposes that Mrs. Elizabeth Beeston was Christopher Beeston's widow (*Stage*, 356). But Christopher Beeston's wife was called Jane, not Elizabeth (cf. *Midd. Co. Records*, ii. 107, 110, 114, 120, 128). Malone says William Beeston was Elizabeth Beeston's son (Malone by Boswell, iii. 242). Collier conjectures that William Beeston was Christopher's brother (Collier, ii. 24). In 1639, one George Lillgrave attempted to turn his house, 'adjoining Mrs. Beestone's playhouse,' into a tavern. This was prohibited, because 'the disorder being likely to be such in the tavern joined to the playhouse as will not be possible to be suppressed' (*Cal. State Papers*, 1639).

## COURT PERFORMANCES

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1637. Feb. 7, . . . . | *Cupid's Revenge.* | (Beeston's boys).[1] |
| Feb. 14, . . . . | *Wit without Money.* | ( „ ).[2] |

[1] Malone by Boswell, iii. 239. From the Herbert office-book.

[2] Malone by Boswell, iii. 239. From the Herbert office-book. On May 10, 1637, Christopher Beeston was paid [£20] for 'two plays acted by the New Company.' This payment was no doubt for the plays of Feb. 7 and 14 by Beeston's boys (Chalmers, *Apology*, 510).

END OF VOLUME I

Printed by T. and A. Constable, Printers to His Majesty
at the Edinburgh University Press